NORTH AMERICAN REVIEW

No. DCXI.

MARCH 15, 1907.

CHAPTERS FROM MY AUTOBIOGRAPHY.—XIV.*

BY MARK TWAIN.

PREFATORY NOTE.—Mr. Clemens began to write his autobiography many years ago, and he continues to add to it day by day. It was his original intention to permit no publication of his memoirs until after his death; but, after leaving "Pier No. 70," he concluded that a considerable portion might now suitably be given to the public. It is that portion, garnered from the quarter-million of words already written, which will appear in this REVIEW during the coming year. No part of the autobiography will be published in book form during the lifetime of the author.—EDITOR N. A. R.

[*Dictated Thursday, December 6, 1906.*]

From Susy's Biography of Me.

Feb. 27, Sunday.

Clara's reputation as a baby was always a fine one, mine exactly the contrary. One often related story concerning her braveness as a baby and her own opinion of this quality of hers is this. Clara and I often got slivers in our hands and when mama took them out with a much dreaded needle, Clara was always very brave, and I very cowardly. One day Clara got one of these slivers in her hand, a very bad one, and while mama was taking it out, Clara stood perfectly still without even wincing; I saw how brave she was and turning to mamma said "Mamma isn't

*Copyright, 1906, by HARPER & BROTHERS. All Rights Reserved.

Copyright, 1907, by THE NORTH AMERICAN REVIEW PUBLISHING COMPANY. All Rights Reserved

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

she a brave little thing! presently mamma had to give the little hand quite a dig with the needle and noticing how perfectly quiet Clara was about it she exclaimed, Why Clara! you *are* a brave little thing! Clara responded "No bodys braver but God!"—

Clara's pious remark is the main detail, and Susy has accurately remembered its phrasing. The three-year-older's wound was of a formidable sort, and not one which the mother's surgery would have been equal to. The flesh of the finger had been burst by a cruel accident. It was the doctor that sewed it up, and to all appearances it was he, and the other independent witnesses, that did the main part of the suffering; each stitch that he took made Clara wince slightly, but it shrivelled the others.

I take pride in Clara's remark, because it shows that although she was only three years old, her fireside teachings were already making her a thinker—a thinker and also an observer of proportions. I am not claiming any credit for this. I furnished to the children worldly knowledge and wisdom, but was not competent to go higher, and so I left their spiritual education in the hands of the mother. A result of this modesty of mine was made manifest to me in a very striking way, some years afterward, when Jean was nine years old. We had recently arrived in Berlin, at the time, and had begun housekeeping in a furnished apartment. One morning at breakfast a vast card arrived—an invitation. To be precise, it was a command from the Emperor of Germany to come to dinner. During several months I had encountered socially, on the Continent, men bearing lofty titles; and all this while Jean was becoming more and more impressed, and awed, and subdued, by these imposing events, for she had not been abroad before, and they were new to her—wonders out of dreamland turned into realities. The imperial card was passed from hand to hand, around the table, and examined with interest; when it reached Jean she exhibited excitement and emotion, but for a time was quite speechless; then she said,

"Why, papa, if it keeps going on like this, pretty soon there won't be anybody left for you to get acquainted with but God."

It was not complimentary to think I was not acquainted in that quarter, but she was young, and the young jump to conclusions without reflection.

Necessarily, I did myself the honor to obey the command of the Emperor Wilhelm II. Prince Heinrich, and six or eight

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

other guests were present. The Emperor did most of the talking, and he talked well, and in faultless English. In both of these conspicuousnesses I was gratified to recognize a resemblance to myself—a very exact resemblance; no, almost exact, but not quite that—a modified exactness, with the advantage in favor of the Emperor. My English, like his, is nearly faultless; like him I talk well; and when I have guests at dinner I prefer to do all the talking myself. It is the best way, and the pleasantest. Also the most profitable for the others.

I was greatly pleased to perceive that his Majesty was familiar with my books, and that his attitude toward them was not uncomplimentary. In the course of his talk he said that my best and most valuable book was "Old Times on the Mississippi." I will refer to that remark again, presently.

An official who was well up in the Foreign Office at that time, and had served under Bismarck for fourteen years, was still occupying his old place under Chancellor Caprivi. Smith, I will call him of whom I am speaking, though that is not his name. He was a special friend of mine, and I greatly enjoyed his society, although in order to have it it was necessary for me to seek it as late as midnight, and not earlier. This was because Government officials of his rank had to work all day, after nine in the morning, and then attend official banquets in the evening; wherefore they were usually unable to get life-restoring fresh air and exercise for their jaded minds and bodies earlier than midnight; then they turned out, in groups of two or three, and gratefully and violently tramped the deserted streets until two in the morning. Smith had been in the Government service, at home and abroad, for more than thirty years, and he was now sixty years old, or close upon it. He could not remember a year in which he had had a vacation of more than a fortnight's length; he was weary all through to the bones and the marrow, now, and was yearning for a holiday of a whole three months—yearning so longingly and so poignantly that he had at last made up his mind to make a desperate cast for it and stand the consequences, whatever they might be. It was against all rules to *ask* for a vacation—quite against all etiquette; the shock of it would paralyze the Chancellery; stern etiquette and usage required another form: the applicant was not privileged to ask for a vacation, he must send in his *resignation*. The chancellor

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

would know that the applicant was not really trying to resign, and didn't want to resign, but was merely trying in this left-handed way to get a vacation.

The night before the Emperor's dinner I helped Smith take his exercise, after midnight, and he was full of his project. He had sent in his resignation that day, and was trembling for the result; and naturally, because it might possibly be that the chancellor would be happy to fill his place with somebody else, in which case he could accept the resignation without comment and without offence. Smith was in a very anxious frame of mind; not that he feared that Caprivi was dissatisfied with him, for he had no such fear; it was the Emperor that he was afraid of; he did not know how he stood with the Emperor. He said that while apparently it was Caprivi who would decide his case, it was in reality the Emperor who would perform that service; that the Emperor kept personal watch upon everything, and that no official sparrow could fall to the ground without his privity and consent; that the resignation would be laid before his Majesty, who would accept it or decline to accept it, according to his pleasure, and that then his pleasure in the matter would be communicated by Caprivi. Smith said he would know his fate the next evening, after the imperial dinner; that when I should escort his Majesty into the large salon contiguous to the dining-room, I would find there about thirty men—Cabinet ministers, admirals, generals and other great officials of the Empire—and that these men would be standing talking together in little separate groups of two or three persons; that the Emperor would move from group to group and say a word to each, sometimes two words, sometimes ten words; and that the length of his speech, whether brief or not so brief, would indicate the exact standing in the Emperor's regard, of the man accosted; and that by observing this thermometer an expert could tell, to half a degree, the state of the imperial weather in each case; that in Berlin, as in the imperial days of Rome, the Emperor was the sun, and that his smile or his frown meant good fortune or disaster to the man upon whom it should fall. Smith suggested that I watch the thermometer while the Emperor went his rounds of the groups; and added that if his Majesty talked four minutes with any person there present, it meant high favor, and that the sun was in the zenith, and cloudless, for that man.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

I mentally recorded that four-minute altitude, and resolved to see if any man there on that night stood in sufficient favor to achieve it.

Very well. After the dinner I watched the Emperor while he passed from group to group, and privately I timed him with a watch. Two or three times he came near to reaching the four-minute altitude, but always he fell short a little. The last man he came to was Smith. He put his hand on Smith's shoulder and began to talk to him; and when he finished, the thermometer had scored seven minutes! The company then moved toward the smoking-room, where cigars, beer and anecdotes would be in brisk service until midnight, and as Smith passed me he whispered,

"That settles it. The chancellor will ask me how much of a vacation I want, and I sha'n't be afraid to raise the limit. I shall call for six months."

Smith's dream had been to spend his three months' vacation—in case he got a vacation instead of the other thing—in one of the great capitals of the Continent—a capital whose name I shall suppress, at present. The next day the chancellor asked him how much of a vacation he wanted, and where he desired to spend it. Smith told him. His prayer was granted, and rather more than granted. The chancellor augmented his salary and attached him to the German Embassy of that selected capital, giving him a place of high dignity bearing an imposing title, and with nothing to do except attend banquets of an extraordinary character at the Embassy, once or twice a year. The term of his vacation was not specified; he was to continue it until requested to come back to his work in the Foreign Office. This
(1891.) was in 1891. Eight years later Smith was passing through Vienna, and he called upon me. There had been no interruption of his vacation, as yet, and there was no
(1899.) likelihood that an interruption of it would occur while he should still be among the living.

[*Dictated Monday, December 17, 1906.*] As I have already remarked, "Old Times on the Mississippi" got the Kaiser's best praise. It was after midnight when I reached home; I was usually out until toward midnight, and the pleasure of being out late was poisoned, every night, by the dread of what I must meet at my front door—an indignant face,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

a resentful face, the face of the *portier*. The *portier* was a tow-headed young German, twenty-two or three years old; and it had been for some time apparent to me that he did not enjoy being hammered out of his sleep, nights, to let me in. He never had a kind word for me, nor a pleasant look. I couldn't understand it, since it was his business to be on watch and let the occupants of the several flats in at any and all hours of the night. I could not see why he so distinctly failed to get reconciled to it.

The fact is, I was ignorantly violating, every night, a custom in which he was commercially interested. I did not suspect this. No one had told me of the custom, and if I had been left to guess it, it would have taken me a very long time to make a success of it. It was a custom which was so well established and so universally recognized, that it had all the force and dignity of law. By authority of this custom, whosoever entered a Berlin house after ten at night must pay a trifling toll to the *portier* for breaking his sleep to let him in. This tax was either two and a half cents or five cents, I don't remember which; but I had never paid it, and didn't know I owed it, and as I had been residing in Berlin several weeks, I was so far in arrears that my presence in the German capital was getting to be a serious disaster to that young fellow.

I arrived from the imperial dinner sorrowful and anxious, made my presence known and prepared myself to wait in patience the tedious minute or two which the *portier* usually allowed himself to keep me tarrying—as a punishment. But this time there was no stage-wait; the door was instantly unlocked, unbolted, unchained and flung wide; and in it appeared the strange and welcome apparition of the *portier's* round face all sunshine and smiles and welcome, in place of the black frowns and hostility that I was expecting. Plainly he had not come out of his bed: he had been waiting for me, watching for me. He began to pour out upon me in the most enthusiastic and energetic way a generous stream of German welcome and homage, meanwhile dragging me excitedly to his small bedroom beside the front door; there he made me bend down over a row of German translations of my books and said,

"There—you wrote them! I have found it out! By God, I did not know it before, and I ask a million pardons! That one

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

there, the 'Old Times on the Mississippi,' is the best book you ever wrote!"

The usual number of those curious accidents which we call coincidences have fallen to my share in this life, but for picturesqueness this one puts all the others in the shade: that a crowned head and a *portier,* the very top of an empire and the very bottom of it, should pass the very same criticism and deliver the very same verdict upon a book of mine—and almost in the same hour and the same breath—is a coincidence which outcoincidences any coincidence which I could have imagined with such powers of imagination as I have been favored with; and I have not been accustomed to regard them as being small or of an inferior quality. It is always a satisfaction to me to remember that whereas I do not know, for sure, what any other nation thinks of any one of my twenty-three volumes, I do at least know for a certainty what one nation of fifty millions thinks of one of them, at any rate; for if the mutual verdict of the top of an empire and the bottom of it does not establish for good and all the judgment of the entire nation concerning that book, then the axiom that we can get a sure estimate of a thing by arriving at a general average of all the opinions involved, is a fallacy.

[*Dictated Monday, February 10, 1907.*] Two months ago (December 6) I was dictating a brief account of a private dinner in Berlin, where the Emperor of Germany was host and I the chief guest. Something happened day before yesterday which moves me to take up that matter again.

At the dinner his Majesty chatted briskly and entertainingly along in easy and flowing English, and now and then he interrupted himself to address a remark to me, or to some other individual of the guests. When the reply had been delivered, he resumed his talk. I noticed that the table etiquette tallied with that which was the law of my house at home when we had guests: that is to say, the guests answered when the host favored them with a remark, and then quieted down and behaved themselves until they got another chance. If I had been in the Emperor's chair and he in mine, I should have felt infinitely comfortable and at home, and should have done a world of talking, and done it well; but I was guest now, and consequently I felt less at home. From old experience, I was familiar with the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

rules of the game, and familiar with their exercise from the high place of host; but I was not familiar with the trammelled and less satisfactory position of guest, therefore I felt a little strange and out of place. But there was no animosity—no, the Emperor was host, therefore according to my own rule he had a right to do the talking, and it was my honorable duty to intrude no interruptions or other improvements, except upon invitation; and of course it could be *my* turn some day: some day, on some friendly visit of inspection to America, it might be my pleasure and distinction to have him as guest at my table; then I would give him a rest, and a remarkably quiet time.

In one way there was a difference between his table and mine —for instance, atmosphere; the guests stood in awe of him, and naturally they conferred that feeling upon me, for, after all, I am only human, although I regret it. When a guest answered a question he did it with deferential voice and manner; he did not put any emotion into it, and he did not spin it out, but got it out of his system as quickly as he could, and then looked relieved. The Emperor was used to this atmosphere, and it did not chill his blood; maybe it was an inspiration to him, for he was alert, brilliant and full of animation; also he was most gracefully and felicitously complimentary to my books,—and I will remark here that the happy phrasing of a compliment is one of the rarest of human gifts, and the happy delivery of it another. In that other chapter I mentioned the high compliment which he paid to the book, "Old Times on the Mississippi," but there were others; among them some gratifying praise of my description in "A Tramp Abroad" of certain striking phases of German student life. I mention these things here because I shall have occasion to hark back to them presently.

[*Dictated Tuesday, February 12, 1907.*]

* * * * * * * * *

Those stars indicate the long chapter which I dictated yesterday, a chapter which is much too long for magazine purposes, and therefore must wait until this Autobiography shall appear in book form, five years hence, when I am dead: five years according to my calculation, twenty-seven years according to the prediction furnished me a week ago by the latest and most confident of all the palmists who have ever read my future in my hand. The Emperor's dinner, and its beer-and-anecdote appendix, covered six hours of diligent

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

industry, and this accounts for the extraordinary length of that chapter.

A couple of days ago a gentleman called upon me with a message. He had just arrived from Berlin, where he had been acting for our Government in a matter concerning tariff revision, he being a member of the commission appointed by our Government to conduct our share of the affair. Upon the completion of the commission's labors, the Emperor invited the members of it to an audience, and in the course of the conversation he made a reference to me; continuing, he spoke of my chapter on the German language in "A Tramp Abroad," and characterized it by an adjective which is too complimentary for me to repeat here without bringing my modesty under suspicion. Then he paid some compliments to "The Innocents Abroad," and followed these with the remark that my account in one of my books of certain striking phases of German student life was the best and truest that had ever been written. By this I perceive that he remembers that dinner of sixteen years ago, for he said the same thing to me about the student-chapter at that time. Next he said he wished this gentleman to convey two messages to America from him and deliver them—one to the President, the other to me. The wording of the message to me was:

"Convey to Mr. Clemens my kindest regards. Ask him if he remembers that dinner, and ask him why he didn't do any talking."

Why, how could I talk when he was talking? He "held the age," as the poker-clergy say, and two can't talk at the same time with good effect. It reminds me of the man who was reproached by a friend, who said,

"I think it a shame that you have not spoken to your wife for fifteen years. How do you explain it? How do you justify it?"

That poor man said,

"I didn't want to interrupt her."

If the Emperor had been at my table, he would not have suffered from my silence, he would only have suffered from the sorrows of his own solitude. If I were not too old to travel I would go to Berlin and introduce the etiquette of my own table, which tallies with the etiquette observable at other royal tables. I would say, "Invite me again, your Majesty, and give me a chance"; then I would courteously waive rank and do all the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

talking myself. I thank his Majesty for his kind message, and am proud to have it and glad to express my sincere reciprocation of its sentiments.

[*Dictated January 17, 1906.*] . . . Rev. Joseph T. Harris and I have been visiting General Sickles. Once, twenty or twenty-five years ago, just as Harris was coming out of his gate Sunday morning to walk to his church and preach, a telegram was put into his hand. He read it immediately, and then, in a manner, collapsed. It said: "General Sickles died last night at midnight." [He had been a chaplain under Sickles through the war.]

It wasn't so. But no matter — it was so to Harris at the time. He walked along—walked to the church—but his mind was far away. All his affection and homage and worship of his General had come to the fore. His heart was full of these emotions. He hardly knew where he was. In his pulpit, he stood up and began the service, but with a voice over which he had almost no command. The congregation had never seen him thus moved, before, in his pulpit. They sat there and gazed at him and wondered what was the matter; because he was now reading, in this broken voice and with occasional tears trickling down his face, what to them seemed a quite unemotional chapter—that one about Moses begat Aaron, and Aaron begat Deuteronomy, and Deuteronomy begat St. Peter, and St. Peter begat Cain, and Cain begat Abel—and he was going along with this, and half crying—his voice continually breaking. The congregation left the church that morning without being able to account for this most extraordinary thing—as it seemed to them. That a man who had been a soldier for more than four years, and who had preached in that pulpit so many, many times on really moving subjects, without even the quiver of a lip, should break all down over the Begats, they couldn't understand. But there it is—any one can see how such a mystery as that would arouse the curiosity of those people to the boiling-point.

(1880.)

Harris has had many adventures. He has more adventures in a year than anybody else has in five. One Saturday night he noticed a bottle on his uncle's dressing-bureau. He thought the label said "Hair Restorer," and he took it in his room and gave his head a good drenching and sousing with it and carried it back and thought no more about it. Next morning when he got up his head was a bright green! He sent around everywhere

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

and couldn't get a substitute preacher, so he had to go to his church himself and preach—and he did it. He hadn't a sermon in his barrel—as it happened—of any lightsome character, so he had to preach a very grave one—a very serious one—and it made the matter worse. The gravity of the sermon did not harmonize with the gayety of his head, and the people sat all through it with handkerchiefs stuffed in their mouths to try to keep down their joy. And Harris told me that he was sure he never had seen his congregation—the whole body of his congregation—the *entire* body of his congregation—absorbed in interest in his sermon, from beginning to end, before. Always there had been an aspect of indifference, here and there, or wandering, somewhere; but this time there was nothing of the kind. Those people sat there as if they thought, "Good for this day and train only: we must have all there is of this show, not waste any of it." And he said that when he came down out of the pulpit more people waited to shake him by the hand and tell him what a good sermon it was, than ever before. And it seemed a pity that these people should do these fictions in such a place—right in the church—when it was quite plain they were not interested in the sermon at all; they only wanted to get a near view of his head.

Well, Harris said—no, Harris didn't say, *I* say, that as the days went on and Sunday followed Sunday, the interest in Harris's hair grew and grew; because it didn't stay merely and monotonously green, it took on deeper and deeper shades of green; and then it would change and become reddish, and would go from that to some other color—purplish, yellowish, bluish, and so on—but it was never a solid color. It was always mottled. And each Sunday it was a little more interesting than it was the Sunday before—and Harris's head became famous, and people came from New York, and Boston, and South Carolina, and Japan, and so on, to look. There wasn't seating-capacity for all the people that came while his head was undergoing these various and fascinating mottlings. And it was a good thing in several ways, because the business had been languishing a little, and now a lot of people joined the church so that they could have the show, and it was the beginning of a prosperity for that church which has never diminished in all these years.

MARK TWAIN.

(To be Continued.)

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE REED SMOOT DECISION.

BY SHELBY M. CULLOM, UNITED STATES SENATOR FROM ILLINOIS.

THE proposition which has been so long before the Senate concerning the exclusion of Reed Smoot from this body, has proved as difficult of solution as it is serious. That it has not been considered as anything light or trivial is abundantly evident from the three years of most arduous labor which the Senate Committee on Privileges and Elections has devoted to the subject—to every phase of it which has been presented—and to the vast amount of testimony which has been taken from every source available. It has been an earnest and untiring effort to arrive at a just conclusion, observing both the demands of public opinion and the demands of the Constitution; the rights of the people and the rights of Reed Smoot.

From the nature of the case, the Senate and the public have been forced to consider the case from widely different, almost diametrically opposite, view-points. This obvious necessity has made the course of the Senate more difficult, because from its different position the public has deluged the Senate with memorials, petitions, personal applications—sometimes approaching too close to demands that Senators should see things in certain lights and act accordingly.

While the Senate Committee has been probing every charge and taking voluminous testimony—testimony that was not always reliable, but out of which the truth has finally been sifted and ably presented by various members of the Committee—the public has been supplied with equally voluminous fiction, sentiment and prejudiced impression, as well as with facts, and with comparatively little opportunity to sift and discriminate; with little certainty that its estimates were founded upon substantial truth.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

It is also a fact which few appreciate that members of the Senate, as Senators, have been obliged to look at the matter in a very different light from that in which the public saw it. In reality, the opinions expressed in many of the petitions and memorials—signed by thousands of our country's most patriotic citizens—are opinions which are as earnestly held in the Senate as outside. The convictions and conclusions are mutually possessed, though a vote in apparent antagonism to them may seem to many to indicate the contrary.

If the different view-points could be fully understood, this apparent antagonism would disappear, and with it the danger that the Senate of the United States might be misconceived as endorsing the universally deprecated evils of Mormonism.

In the nature of things, I am perhaps as capable as any of seeing both sides and sympathizing with both sides, because throughout my public life—as Speaker of the House in my State Legislature, as Governor of Illinois, as member of the National House of Representatives and as a member of the Senate—my record has been one of persistent, unqualified opposition to Mormonism as it has been in the past, and as it is to-day if the same evils still exist or just so far as they exist. Mormonism, as it was, has always and upon every possible occasion received from me the severest condemnation, because of what appeared to me two most objectionable features. I refer, of course, to polygamy and hierarchy. We cannot, we must not, have the taint of either touch our history or the stain of either tinge the fair record of our nation. We cannot afford to allow the evil breath of either to influence the course of a single State or the smallest part of any State in our commonwealth. The voice of every earnest, conscientious, worthy citizen is raised against such an issue. This has always been my profound conviction and has caused me, through the past three years, to sympathize thoroughly and deeply with every honest and unprejudiced effort of public opinion to assert itself against these evils; to encourage every legitimate act of legislation which tended to reduce their influence or obliterate them.

My position is the same to-day as it has always been. I would not retract or change an act I have done or a word I have spoken or written in antagonism to the evils of Mormonism. But it is perfectly obvious that the evils of Mormonism are not what they

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

were. I am satisfied that polygamy, for example, has been practically obliterated; that the last of it lives in the midst of detestation, even from its fellow Mormons; that nothing further is needed to wholly abolish the miserable remnant that remains but the spirit of decency which forced intercourse with the true and the honorable has instilled through the very heart of Mormonism and must continue to instil without the aid of external agitation. Incidentally, I am satisfied that Reed Smoot has never practised polygamy, but on the contrary has always set his face against it by both practice and precept.

Polygamy could not long exist in any community brought into contact with the world through the facilities of modern intercourse and the necessities of commerce. I am convinced that we have nothing more to fear from this evil of Mormonism, and that the Senate could have found no reason to allow this question to influence its vote.

The remaining evil of the Mormon Church is of graver and more subtle importance and more difficult to deal with. If the Church be really the hierarchy which by many it has been represented to be, and a dominating feature of influence in local, State or national life, it behooves us to combat it everywhere and under all circumstances, and I give my most earnest cooperation to every honest effort in that direction. We can no better afford to have our national life tainted by church hierarchy than to have our social life tainted by polygamy. There is no difference of opinion here. There is complete unity of thought and purpose. There was no need of hundreds of thousands of signatures upon petitions and memorials to incite this sentiment in every clean, honest patriot. But the petitions, the basis of which we all respect, piled higher and higher because public sentiment, in fighting against the evils of Mormonism—either real or honestly believed to be real—was determined to strike a blow through the apostle of the Mormon Church whom the State of Utah had legally elected and the Senate had formally accepted as its representative.

I can conceive of no more unfortunate misconception than to suppose the Senate of the United States open to the influence of these memorials and petitions when once it took cognizance of the charges brought against the Senator from Utah, with the view to prove him unworthy of his seat in the Senate. From that

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

moment, every Senator was obliged, of necessity, to assume the position of a judge upon the bench—a judge from whose verdict there could be no appeal. It was not in legislative but in judicial capacity that testimony was heard and witnesses examined. It was as a judicial body, not as a legislature, that the Senate had to pass judgment. If the public had realized this it would have realized that, in the presentation of testimony to establish the charges and make good the case, lay its only legitimate method of influence. Memorials and petitions were as much out of place, in urging one decision or another, as if they had been presented to a court in the act of trying a case.

As individuals, Senators have sympathized with every effort to eradicate the evils of Mormonism, but he would be false to his oath of office and his duty to his country who allowed either personal prejudice, political antagonism or any amount of external influence to affect his judgment in a question of constitutional rights. The Senate had simply the legal rights of Reed Smoot to his seat in the Chamber to consider, in the light of all the evidence which in three years the Committee on Privileges and Elections had been able to collect. It had no choice or duty but to consider whatever charges were established as they affected Smoot's legal right to retain the seat to which he had been elected and in which he had been confirmed. In this light the charges themselves were weak, being from their inception aimed more at Mormonism than at Reed Smoot.

Mr. Smoot's personal record is clean. In the Senate, he has won the esteem and respect of his colleagues for many good qualities which he has exhibited. As an earnest, honest, conscientious member no one has assailed him. His home life is without a known blemish. These facts added weight to his own testimony before the Committee, to the effect that there was nothing in any oath of office he had taken, or any vow he had made in connection with the Church, which could impair his usefulness or conflict with his duty as a Senator. It is impossible, under such circumstances, not to give greater weight to this testimony than to the uncertain, often obviously sensational and fanciful, testimony to the contrary.

The question, the only question, before the Senate was whether, under these conditions, there was that in Reed Smoot, individually, which rendered him unworthy of the high office which he held.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Wholly without respect or reference to any Senator's personal convictions concerning Mormonism and the Mormon Church, the conclusion concerning Mr. Smoot as a member of the Senate was unavoidable. The verdict was one concerning Smoot's constitutional right to his seat in the Senate. It was in no way a verdict or an opinion concerning Mormonism. This is something that should be distinctly borne in mind by the earnest workers for the purity, integrity and honor of our country. They should not for a moment think that their efforts lack the sympathy and deep appreciation of their representatives. We must not for a moment relax our efforts against hierarchy, whether in church, community, State or country. It must not be allowed to impress itself upon our institutions or cast its shadow across our land.

I believe that in the end it will be found that the course of the Senate has really done more to effectively place the ban upon it, to suppress and crush the tendency as expressed in the Mormon Church, to denounce hierarchy everywhere, than if sentiment and prejudice had been allowed to gather force from popular agitation and Reed Smoot had been practically made its martyr.

SHELBY M. CULLOM.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

QUEER DIPLOMACY WITH CASTRO.

BY HERBERT W. BOWEN, FORMERLY UNITED STATES MINISTER TO VENEZUELA.

AFTER the blockade instituted in December, 1902, by Germany, Great Britain and Italy had been raised, and protocols had been signed for the settlement of all duly recognized claims of foreign nations against Venezuela, Venezuela enjoyed a short period of tranquillity; but, by the beginning of 1905, every legation in Caracas had a list of grievances founded on alleged unfair awards of arbitrators, on denials of justice on the part of the Venezuelan Courts and on the diminution by President Castro of the percentage he had agreed to pay to the creditor nations from the receipts of his custom-houses. Moreover, Germany and Great Britain began to show signs of restlessness, because President Castro had not provided, as had been agreed in the protocols, for the payment of interest to British and German bondholders. The situation looked even worse than before the blockade, for the principal nation aggrieved was the United States, and it had the moral support of all the other nations represented in Caracas by legations.

The main issue between the United States and Venezuela was the asphalt case. In July, 1904, President Castro had demanded ten million dollars from the American Company, known as the "New York and Bermudez Asphalt Company," and had threatened, if that amount was not paid immediately, that the whole asphalt lake and the property of the Company would be seized. He based his demand on the alleged support given by the Asphalt Company to the Matos revolution of 1902; but, as he did not demand anything from the countless other supporters of the revolution, it was clear that his demand on the Asphalt Company was piratical. The demand was refused, and the lake

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

and property were seized. The Government of the United States naturally protested vigorously against President Castro's high-handed procedure, sent a military attaché to Caracas and prepared, as the newspapers announced, to take drastic measures to secure justice and to maintain its dignity and prestige.

At this juncture, a proposition was made by the American legation at Caracas to President Castro, to settle by arbitration all pending disputes with the United States and other nations. His Minister for Foreign Affairs urged him to accept the plan, and he finally gave a favorable answer. President Roosevelt and Mr. Hay were then consulted, and they at once approved of the main part of the plan, as is shown by the following extract from our book of Foreign Relations, 1905:

"*The Secretary of State to Minister Bowen. Telegram—Paraphrase.*

"*January 9, 1905.*—Mr. Hay states that the President approves acceptance of 5,000,000 bolivars, annually to be paid to all creditor Powers from customs revenues, provided said Powers assent. The President could not interfere in any way in relation to German and British bondholders, that being a question in which the Government is not concerned.

"The President approves the suggestion of an arbitration treaty with the United States for settlement of all questions which, being of a diplomatic character, cannot be settled by mutual consent. Also of the provision to settle by arbitration unsettled claims of all the Powers, except contractual claims and bonds held by citizens of other Governments.

"The Department will cable Mr. Bowen bases of protocol for arbitration of all disputed claims of the United States and other nations, excepting bonds and all claims of a contractual nature.

"The Department will take under advisement the question of a permanent treaty of arbitration."

President Castro was duly informed of the entire contents of the cablegram, and it seemed to him and his Ministers perfectly satisfactory. Private arrangements were made with the British and German bondholders, and ultimately their claims were duly paid; so the situation was favorable to a clean and complete settlement of all the grievances of the creditor nations. The bases of the protocol promised by Mr. Hay were, consequently, now eagerly awaited. They would, it was thought, mark the beginning of a new era in South-American diplomacy, promote arbitration generally, and lessen to such an extent the causes for

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

European aggression in South-American waters as practically to relieve the United States of all apprehension that the Monroe Doctrine would be attacked. Three days after the receipt at Caracas of Mr. Hay's cablegram—to wit, on January 12th, 1905—the promised protocol arrived by cable. It was signed by Mr. Loomis and did not cover the 5,000,000 bolivar agreement, nor the claims of other nations, nor anything except the asphalt case! And it was couched in such displeasing terms that President Castro immediately rejected it. No word of explanation or apology accompanied it. The Venezuelan Government, as well as the American Minister, was astounded. Subsequently, it was learned that the entire protocol had been written by the attorney of the Asphalt Company. The explanation offered by President Castro's friends was that the Asphalt Company feared arbitration, and so broke up the entire scheme by getting an offensive protocol sent to President Castro. Negotiations were continued for a time to induce President Castro to settle the asphalt case, but he sent to Washington an agent, who succeeded absolutely in undermining the influence of Mr. Hay, as is shown by his cablegram to President Castro sent just after Mr. Hay addressed his so-called "ultimatum" to Venezuela, and stating in substance that after President Castro had answered the ultimatum the matter would be allowed to drop.

Several attempts have been made to fix on Mr. Hay the responsibility for all the occurrences in the Department of State at this time, but it is now pretty generally known that he was utterly unable to cope with the forces arrayed against him.

President Castro was, of course, much pleased to have the whole scheme of arbitration fail, for he would not now have to pay a fixed and fair sum from the receipts of his custom-houses, nor settle his other debts, nor have the acts and decisions of his courts reviewed and criticised by arbitrators. The entire result was satisfactory to him. The United States had practically said to him: Arbitrate or fight. He had serenely answered that he would do neither. He was then asked to settle the controversy by diplomacy, but by this time he was unwilling to do so, as he had become a strong supporter of the Calvo and the Drago Doctrines, which, if generally accepted, would prevent foreign nations from enforcing their right to protect their citizens and subjects from spoliation in South-American countries, and from

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

collecting their debts by armed intervention or occupation of territory. In short, President Castro joined the ranks of those who want all the rights of sovereignty without any of the responsibilities.

As Venezuela is the most turbulent of the South-American Republics, and as they are all aware that we proposed to her a far-reaching scheme of arbitration, and then dropped it without excuse or apology, it would seem as if we have united them all more closely in their support of the Calvo and Drago Doctrines, and have, on the other hand, strengthened the determination of Europe to ignore those Doctrines, thereby increasing the chances of conflict between the European and South-American Governments, and adding to the possible dangers that may disturb our own tranquillity and peace.

HERBERT W. BOWEN.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE STORM CENTRE IN THE NEAR EAST

BY KARL BLIND.

I.

All those who are able to appreciate the matchless benefit which the civilization of the world has derived from ancient Hellenic culture and from its revival, in the Renaissance Age of humanistic studies down to our days, are looking with grave anxiety to what the coming spring and summer will bring forth. I refer to that much-disturbed "weather-corner"—as the Germans phrase it — called "Macedonia" as well as to Bulgaria, where at present a wholesale and most atrocious persecution of the Greek inhabitants of this country takes place.

The greatest apprehensions exist at Athens itself. It is not only on account of the renewed bloodthirsty campaign of Bulgarian bands which have again broken into Macedonia, or of the arrival, in the Piræus, week after week, of such masses of Greek exiles from Eastern Rumelia and from the Bulgarian Kingdom at large, owing to the cruel measures deliberately taken against that nationality by the Government of Sofia. It is chiefly, also, because in England an active political group does its worst to encourage the Bulgarian rulers to effect a formal military intervention in Macedonia by means of its army; hints being given that, in such a case, England would furnish aid for that venture! These attempts need to be fully shown up, while there is still time. The maintenance of the peace of all Europe is involved in these occurrences.

A few months ago, when the Interparliamentary Conference was held in London, I had occasion to discuss this subject with a number of notable Greeks, some of whom had come here as representatives of the Legislature at Athens. Among them was Mr. Mauromichalis, a former Cabinet Minister, who has been Secre-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

tary-at-War and head of the Admiralty. He is a descendant of a famous family, many of whose members played a leading part in the War of Independence. I have frequent occasions, too, to learn the feelings of other distinguished Greeks in the political world, former and present ambassadors, public writers, as well as men of the great merchant class in the Greek communities in England. And I can fully testify to the very bitter feelings prevailing among them. They stand aghast at the incomprehensible swerving round of public opinion (or what is artificially made to appear as such) in this once phil-Hellene "land of Lord Byron," who laid down his life in the Greek War of Independence.

"What aims and objects," the Greeks ask, "has this strange policy? What are we to think of such action on the part of Liberals, who fall into the nets craftily spread by men whose doings virtually serve Russian policy in the East? Can it be forgotten that, by the Treaty of San Stefano, Russian Tsardom sought to gain access for Bulgaria to the Ægean Sea, whilst trying to get for itself the military and financial overlordship in Bulgaria? Are the terrible and murderous plots to be forgotten by which the Government of St. Petersburg has for years endeavored to obtain the mastery over Bulgaria?"

Not being able, at present, to pursue an active policy of attack in the Near East, Muscovite Autocracy still works for its well-known aim by supporting Bulgarian aggression, so as to keep up a state of general disturbance for future use. The procedures of Russian consuls and ambassadors in the East prove this to a sufficient extent. No wonder if Bulgarian freebooters, when released from captivity at the demand of those representatives of the Russian Government, exclaim, on leaving prison: "Long live our Tsar Nicholas!"

Guns, ammunition, dynamite, money, for the Bulgarian freebooters, have been clearly traced to Muscovite sources. The complicity of the Government at Sofia with the irruptions into Macedonia is so patent that the Opposition press and the Opposition speakers in the Bulgarian Parliament itself have repeatedly denounced it in the strongest words possible.

II.

In order to clear the ground as to the race question in Macedonia, a few details may here at once be given. By unscrupulous

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

writers, whose manœuvres cannot be too strongly reproved, it is often made out that that still Turkish province is mainly inhabited by a Slav race—namely, Bulgars, identical in blood with those of the neighboring Principality.

Now, first of all, the Bulgars are originally not a Slav race. They are of Tartar, Mongolian, descent. They originally lived near the river Volga; hence their name of Volgars, Bolgars or Bulgars. Making an incursion into the Balkan countries many centuries ago, and establishing themselves there, they became Slavonized in speech. Physically, their aspect, as well as their qualities, still indicates their Tartar origin in a great measure. I need not say that I state this merely as an historical fact, not wishing in the least to draw an insidious conclusion therefrom. I am not in any way given to race hatred.

As to "Macedonia," the very word is scarcely known to the masses, of whatever national origin, which at present inhabit that province. Historically, in ancient times, there lived there a people of Thrakian (Thracian) kinship. It can clearly be shown to have been in close relationship with the vast Getic, Gothic, Germanic stock that once filled Eastern Europe, up to the High North, and the greater part of Asia Minor. Those Thrakian Macedonians, of whom Alexander the Great is the most notable in history, became, in the course of time, Hellenized in culture and speech. Afterwards, in the disturbed times of the early Middle Ages, Bulgars and other race fragments made incursions upon that Hellenized Thrakian population which, of old, had been added to by Greeks pushing up from the South.

Thus, to this day, not less than seven races, each with a different speech, exist in Macedonia; that is, in the three Turkish *vilayets* (departments) of Kossovo, Monastir and Salonika, which are usually, though somewhat erroneously, held to constitute that province. There are in it Greeks, Bulgars, Turks, Serbs, Kutzo-Wallachs (kindred in language, or rather dialect, to the people of the Rumanian Kingdom near the Danube, who speak a daughter-language of Latin), Albans and even Jews. These last, often thickly clustering together in certain localities, are reckoned, in the East, as a special nationality. Surely, a multicolored conglomerate of Macedonian races!

Yet the attempt of the Bulgarian bands, which have the Government authorities of Sofia stealthily at their back, has been,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

for about four years, to effect by every means of terror and bloodshed the forcible Bulgarization of the whole province. The unfortunate victims have been and are the Greeks, who, in the two southern departments of "Macedonia," are statistically provable to be in a largely preponderating majority. Whilst, in the northernmost *vilayet* of Kossovo, there is a Slav-speaking majority, the two southern departments have 348,050 Greeks against 205,886 Bulgars in Salonika; and 309,782 Greeks against only 174,000 Bulgars in Monastir.

Thus, the whole south of the Turkish province in question, which is the real "Macedonia," has a clear majority of Hellenic people. They are certainly by far the more highly developed national element, and the influence of their culture reaches also north—just as it does eastwards into Asia Minor and southwards even into Egypt.

III.

Yet, for years past, this more civilized population, living outside of, but close to, the frontier of Greece, has been the object of incessant attacks from the brigand raids of Bulgarian bands, who under the false parole of "Macedonia for the Macedonians," try to denationalize the superior Greek element by the most outrageous means of murder and arson. The deeds done in many cases transport us, in mind, to what has occurred in the most barbarous, even prehistoric, times of out-and-out savagery. It was, and it is, a perfect tragedy. The assassination game is almost too awful for words.

At last the Greeks resolved upon their own defence by the organization of three corps. They are attacked by the Bulgars both as a race, and because Greeks, in their religious creed, keep to the Patriarchate at Constantinople, whereas the Bulgars follow the so-called Exarch. That high priest is the Muscovite favorite.

And this detestable struggle, in which the aggressors are actuated by clerical bigotry, as well as by race hatred—a struggle of Christians against Christians—is falsely described, by men who advocate a military intervention of the Government at Sofia, as if it were a struggle of the "Christian Macedonians" against the "Infidel Turk!" Could misrepresentation, systematic misleading of public opinion, further go!

Those who urge on such interference do not care whether, by an operation of that kind, a general war would be lighted up—

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

a war which soon might spread into Asia and Africa, throughout the Mohammedan world, which finds itself more and more hard pressed by an injudicious policy of Christian Powers in the Near East, in Egypt and in India. For, let it not be forgotten that, according to the testimony even of men who would fain break up the Ottoman Empire, the progress of culture has reached also the younger generation of Turks. It has reached equally so the younger men of Mussulman faith, or outward creed, in the land of the Nile, and in the far-off Asiatic dominions of England.

Now, what a farce it was, on the part of the European Powers, to appoint the Russian Tsar and the Government of Austria-Hungary as reformers of the maladministration of the Sultan, and as healers of the troubles, in Macedonia. "Physician, heal thyself!" Russia, in the throes of a sanguinary revolution against an Autocracy loaded with more sins of hideous oppression than the Sultan Abdul-Hamid! And the Government of Austria-Hungary—where Germans and Czechs, Magyars and many Slav populations, Poles, Ruthenians, Slovaks, Serbs, Italians and Rumanians are in the most discordant strife on national and constitutional matters—forsooth, that Government also is to be the great medicine-man for curing the race evils of the Ottoman Empire, and of Macedonia especially! Here it would be difficult not to write a satire.

To give an idea of the cold-bloodedness with which the chiefs of the Bulgarian freebooters go to work in their attacks upon the Greeks in Macedonia, it may be useful to quote the most prominent of them, Boris Sarafoff. He is the so-called "Reviser of the Inner Organization," and has just returned from a prolonged secret stay in Macedonia, in view of an intended renewal of the campaign there. Shortly before he went away from Sofia, he said to a German interviewer:

> "We have not, since 1903, forced anybody to make common cause with us. We only demanded, wher explaining our object and distributing arms, that everybody should preserve proper silence, and not act as a traitor. Now, whoever became a traitor was killed, irrespective of nationality. It was for disloyalty they were punished with death—but only because they were traitors, not because they were Greeks or Serbs."

How very simple! When you have a Greek or a Servian Slav before you, who objects to being violently made into a Bulgar, you call him a "traitor" and then slaughter him. By such a

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

plain process all difficulties standing in the way are easily disposed of; for, as Mr. Sarafoff says: "We want an autonomous Macedonia."

He then went, in that interview, into a fantastic plan of a fresh campaign and the future convocation of a Macedonian "National Assembly" (of course, after Greeks, Serbs and other incongruous impediments have been killed off) for the purpose of electing a Prince as ruler. Add to this that, during the last few years, rival Bulgarian freebooters' bands have even fallen upon and massacred each other; and the picture of the "Macedonian Chaos" leaves little to be desired in abominable confusion.

IV.

Striking testimony to the real state of things has been given by Mr. Kyriakulis Mauromichalis, whom I have before mentioned, and who occupies at present a leading position in Parliament. When Mr. Sarafoff, the Bulgarian freebooter's chief, was asked how it could be explained that, in the last campaign in Macedonia, his followers were finally driven back into the neighboring Principality, he took good care not to enter into details. It was a bad poser for him. Now on this subject, Mr. Mauromichalis says:

"For years Bulgarian bands formed and fitted out at the cost of the Principality, and commanded by Bulgarian officers, penetrated into Macedonia, terrorizing its populations, massacring the Greek inhabitants, burning their property, destroying their villages, in order to force them to give up their religious faith and their national conscience by declaring themselves 'Exarchists'—that is, Bulgars. The Greeks seeing that the Turkish authorities could not, or would not, defend themselves against these armed bands, and that Europe remained deaf to their outcries and their sufferings, felt that nothing was left to them but to take up arms themselves in order to drive back these aggressors. Although continually attacked by the Turkish troops, who had let the Bulgarian bands do their worst, the Greek free-corps succeeded in delivering the country from the terrorists, restoring quiet and making it possible for the peaceful population, without distinction of race and religion, to attend to their affairs. I ask you: Could these Greek free-corps have been able to achieve so happy a result if the country had not been with them, and if the main portion of the population were not Greek?"

The Hellenic statesman then dwelt on the fact of Turks, Bulgars, Jews, and so forth, who reside in Greece, enjoying there the full benefit of absolute freedom. On the contrary, in Bulgaria and Rumania, the numerous Greeks there are the object of the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

most pitiless persecution. Masses of Greeks have had to fly from Bulgaria and Eastern Rumelia which is connected with that Principality. The cities of Anchialos, Burgas, Varna, Philippopolis, Rustschuk and other Bulgarian towns have been the scene of the most disgraceful attacks upon the Greek inhabitants there. They had, and numbers of them still have, to seek safety at Constantinople, Smyrna and Athens.

Scenes of barbarism were enacted, during which thousands of Greeks lost their lives in Bulgaria, and a mass of their property was destroyed. "At last," the distinguished Hellenic statesman says, "Christian Bulgaria had to undergo the disgrace of receiving an indignant protest against all those acts of massacre, destruction and pillage from a Mussulman Government, from the Government of the Turks. And civilized Europe, the Europe of the twentieth century, was not moved by the spectacle of seeing the defence of Christian minorities in a vassal Principality of Turkey taken in hand by the Porte!"

Truly, "upon horror's head, horrors accumulate." It looks as if, for the ill success of Bulgarian bands in Macedonia, revenge were being taken upon the Greeks in Bulgaria itself. Tens of thousands of them have, within the last few months, been driven to emigration by such sanguinary persecution as the Turks themselves, in their conquests, have never been guilty of. In towns like Anchialos, until lately mainly inhabited by Greeks, there have been bloodshed, incendiarism, robbery, violent seizure even of Cathedrals, with the full connivance of the Bulgarian authorities. When the Exarchist bishop solemnly took possession of the Greek Cathedral, after those disgraceful deeds, he did not scruple to declare that "a town which hitherto had been as Greek as Athens, or even more so, was now in course of becoming Bulgarian."

Week by week, some three hundred, four hundred, even five hundred Greeks, have of late landed as exiles from Bulgaria at Constantinople or at Athens. The number has been growing so much that the Turkish authorities finally forbade their disembarking in an Ottoman port. The Government at Athens, scarcely knowing what to do with such an ever-swelling crowd of refugees, has brought in a bill for settling those of the agricultural class in Thessaly, where the State possesses some domains.

To add to the sufferings of the Greek would-be emigrants from Bulgaria, the authorities there have latterly put on them all kinds

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

of arbitrary imposts before permission for leaving the country is given them. If they cannot pay those imposts, which often reach the very amount of their property, embargo is laid upon that property. It has to be left as security, unsaleable by its owner. No wonder many of those emigrants burned their huts and then fled.

These barbarities are of so crying a character that even at Paris —where Tsardom and its Bulgarian protégé are still treated very tenderly, owing to the Russian loans in which masses of Frenchmen are interested—protests have recently been raised. The "*Temps*" makes an appeal to the Cabinet of Sofia in the name of outraged humanity and of the Treaties of 1878, which have been so disgracefully violated in the case of the Greek inhabitants of Bulgaria and Eastern Rumelia.

V.

What can be done? Look at what the Sofia paper, which is the organ of the parliamentary Opposition leader, Daneff, says. It denies that the Principality, as was asserted in the speech from the Throne, "has become an important factor of civilization." It declares, on the contrary, that "Bulgaria has become *an important factor of disorder*." It refers to "excesses of all kinds, to brigandage, incendiarism, daily misdemeanors, thefts, attempts upon the lives and property of men of every race in the realm."

In the Bulgarian Parliament, Mr. Naïto Tsanoff has openly charged the Government with being the author of the anti-Greek movement, and having "promoted inexcusable deeds of such violence as even Rumania, though in conflict with Greece, does not tolerate." The same charge was brought forward by another member, Mr. Tassaroff, who spoke of "the scandal and the barbarism of the anti-Greek movement." These are Bulgarian voices, hence certainly not to be suspected.

Where, then, would it be most necessary to intervene, if an intervention were at all desirable and judicious? Would it be right to appoint the Bulgarian Government as a military executor in Macedonia? Or might it not rather be the proper thing to take that Government to task for its downright violation of the Treaties of 1878 and of the simplest principles of humanity?

Strange to say, one obvious measure of reform for the Macedonian complication and of Turkish Administration in general

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

is never discussed in England now, unless it is done by the writer of this essay. I mean the reconvocation of the Ottoman Parliament, which sat at Constantinople in 1877 and 1878, and which was "prorogued" when the Russian army was before the gates of the Turkish capital. Prorogued it was — not abolished. Prorogued — not even dissolved. To the European Ambassadors, more especially to the one from England, the Sultan formally promised a later reconvocation.

Two successive English Ambassadors have testified to the excellence of the work done, or attempted, by that Parliament, in which Turks, Greeks, Bulgars, Albanians, Egyptians, Arabs, Syrians, harmoniously worked together. A word from England now would force the Sultan to make good his promise of 1878. Why is that word not spoken? "This silence is suspicious!" many Greeks may believe.

Having for many years been in close contact with the leaders of the "Young Turkish" Reformers, who call for the reconvocation of an Ottoman Parliament, I might say more on that most important subject. For the present, be it enough to observe that, in the opinion of the "Young Turks," with the death of Abdul-Hamid—an event probably not far off—a decisive constitutional change may be effected at Constantinople.

KARL BLIND.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

MUNICIPAL GLASGOW.

BY BENJAMIN TAYLOR.

GLASGOW is, no doubt, a very well managed city, as modern cities go, but it is very far from being self-supporting. The more "municipalizing" it becomes, the more its rates grow. In 1905 these reached 2*s.* 9½*d.* per pound sterling of rental for ordinary burghal expenses alone. For water, gas and electricity each citizen has to pay according to his consumption, just as if he were supplied by a private company instead of by the Civic Corporation. And for the support of the poor and schools he has to pay another 1*s.* 6*d.* or so in the pound, just as if he belonged to the worst, instead of (as he is told by flatterers) the best managed city in the kingdom. And what makes the thoughtful Glasgow citizen impatient at the suggestion that he is sitting rate-free is the knowledge that his assessments are growing year by year, to meet the growing capital charges caused by the perpetual extension of the paternal hand of the municipality. Every Ward, for instance, must have its own public hall and its own pleasure-ground, etc. The parks in the different sections must have their boating-lakes and their skating-ponds, their bowling-greens and their golf-links. All very nice, no doubt, but all to be provided out of the public funds, which means the annual assessments of the ratepayers.

Whether street locomotion by electric tramways is a "public utility" proper to municipal administration we need not discuss just here. The tramway system of Glasgow has been so much in evidence in America of late that I do not propose to dwell on it. It is an excellent system of which the citizens are proud, and it is beyond doubt admirably managed. Unlike many municipal undertakings, it pays; but it is pure delusion to claim the profit as proof of the efficiency of municipalization. In a community

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

of a million inhabitants, surrounded by a network of populous industrial and agricultural towns, within an hour's reach of over one-half the population of Scotland, a monopolistic undertaking like the tramway system could not fail to be profitable in any but the most incompetent or inefficient hands. Before the municipality (commonly called the Corporation) took over the system, it was very profitably worked by a limited liability company, when the population was considerably smaller than it is now. The profits then were divided among the shareholders, but the Company was a large contributor to the municipal revenue in rental and rates. The Corporation Tramways Department is not an equivalent contributor, but distributes its profits, or most of them, in reduced fares, longer haulage and improved service. These benefits are admitted, but they are not the perquisite of the ratepayers. The tramways are used by non-ratepayers, outside dwellers and visitors, as much as, perhaps more than, by the ratepayers whose money provided the system and whose representatives and servants manage it.

The tramway department of Glasgow is in a good position. It has the longest track mileage of any tramway undertaking in Great Britain. It has the biggest annual revenue of any tramway undertaking, and all the tramway managers in the country envy it. It has the largest staff in the whole country. The Corporation tramways have been extended a considerable distance into the country districts and have actually extended the city of Glasgow. The railway companies are angry at the tramways just now, because the number of passengers carried by the Scottish railways has had a steady decrease since 1901; but that should all come back to them again with the aid of the tramway connections.

Glasgow is an ancient city and has borne a more prominent part in the history of Scotland than has Edinburgh, the political capital. And now, of course, as the second city in the United Kingdom, it far exceeds all other Scottish towns in industrial and commercial importance. But modern Glasgow, the Municipal Trader, is the product of the evolution of the last forty years. The population of the city forty years ago was 437,850, to-day it is 800,000. The valuation of Glasgow then was £1,743,117, the ratable value of a penny per £1 of rental being £6,500, compared with £5,770,570 and £20,000, respectively, at present.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Forty years ago there were only two public parks — Glasgow Green and Kelvingrove Park — measuring between them 200 acres; to-day there are fifteen parks, with a combined area of 1,091 acres, and in addition there are twenty-three open spaces and recreation-grounds. Forty years ago private gas companies charged 4*s.* 7*d.* per 100 cubic feet for gas; to-day it is supplied by the Corporation at 2*s.* 1*d.* In that period the cost of water for domestic purposes has been reduced from one shilling to five pence per pound on rental. Railway accommodation forty years ago was very much in evidence, and the Glasgow Union Railway bill was passed by Parliament in 1864. The intention of that scheme was to establish in the centre of the city a railway station that would accommodate the requirements of the three companies which had possession of the railway traffic—the North British Railway Company, the Glasgow and South Western Railway Company, and the Caledonian Railway Company; and provision was made both for the terminal and through traffic in an area of seventeen acres defined. The space then considered sufficient for the combined traffic of three separate companies has proved insufficient for one of them. Instead of four small stations that existed forty years ago, Glasgow has now no fewer than fifty-three railway stations within the civic boundary.

The greatest change that has taken place within the municipality during these forty years has been the great scheme of city improvements devised by the late Mr. John Carrick, City Architect. Under the City Improvement Act of 1866, the citizens obtained possession of a public park, and demolished enormous areas of foul, insanitary property, obtaining thirty new streets, and widening and improving twenty-six existing streets, adding 98,999 square yards of ground to the free spaces of the city, and, generally, altering the appearance of the whole of Ancient Glasgow. The municipal area of Glasgow forty years ago measured 5,063 acres, and to-day it is 12,688 acres. At least a million persons now traverse the city either by tramway or by rail every day. No wonder the tramways pay, when there is no opposition except by cabs at a shilling a mile!

The craze for municipalization has not a charm for all town dwellers. It is, at any rate, noteworthy that, since Glasgow became so progressive, the rate of the growth of the population has been checked. This was disclosed in the returns of the City

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Assessor, which show that at June 1st, 1905, the number of "inhabited" houses within the municipality was 162,888, as compared with 163,002 at the corresponding date in 1904. This was a decrease for the year of 114, and it is notable as an actual interruption to a period of growth which had been continuous since 1887. It is the seventh only which has occurred since 1872—the majority, indeed, of the former years of decrease having occurred in the period of commercial depression which followed the failure of the City of Glasgow Bank. During fifteen years the inhabited houses in "old" Glasgow have increased by 7.9 per cent. only, while in the marginal area they have increased by 85 per cent.

Dr. Chalmers, the Medical Officer of Health for the city, estimates 765,162 as the population of the houses within the municipal area, as compared with 765,696 in 1904, representing a decrease of 534. Institution and harbor population, in addition, together number 20,312, compared with 19,769 in 1905, and represent a balance in excess of 543. Adding "house" and "institutional" (including harbor) population together, he estimated the total population within the municipal area at June, 1905, as 785,474, compared with 785,465 in 1904, representing a difference of nine persons only in favor of 1905. The population has only been saved from a numerical reduction by an increase in the number of persons resident in institutions, and, in consequence, removed from opportunities of discharging many of the responsibilities of citizenship. The difference between 1.9 per cent. which was the rate of increase in last decade, and 1.3 per cent. in the present period, represents a reduction of 5,812 persons in the number being annually added to the population.

While within the municipality the rate of increase has fallen to barely one-half, the rate of increase of the marginal parts has almost been maintained at its former level; notwithstanding the lowering of the rate over the whole area. In all, 52,276 persons have been added to the combined population during the period, and of this number 23,765 were added to "inner" Glasgow, while 28,514 were added to other portions of the "outer" ring.

The liabilities (£15,176,044) include the public debt of the city. The assets (£20,627,245) include £3,075,167 for the tramways, £2,634,233 for the gas, £1,311,856 for the electricity, £365,042 for the telephones undertakings, in all of which the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Corporation is exposed to the vicissitudes of invention or of private competition. The Water department asset, £4,153,139, is not so exposed. The value of the rest of the assets depends upon the maintenance of the city as an active, healthy and prosperous community.

The Telephone Department Accounts have been bad enough. In the first year of the telephone enterprise, the revenue was £14,096; in the second, £35,014; in the third, £49,639; and last year, 1905, £55,426. The expenditure in the first year was £13,698; in the second, £33,320; in the third, £46,000; and in 1905, £53,320. Out of this expenditure was laid aside for Sinking-Fund during the four years' existence of the department, £36,163 6*s.* 8*d.*; and for general depreciation fund during the same period, £7,247 13*s* 5*d.* These two sums amount to £43,411. The Corporation received in taxes from the Department over £5,000, and it provided employment for 588 persons. The Department had to meet the competition carried on by the Telephone Company, which can recoup itself by charging higher rates in other places, the Municipal Telephone Department only operating in the city and neighborhood. Last year an agreement between the Post-office and the National Telephone Company for the purchase of the latter company's system was completed and came into force. The Municipal Telephone Committee acted in concert with other telephone-owning municipalities in favor of the municipalities, but the Postmaster-General did not adopt the recommendations of that Committee.

The telephone accounts have been denounced as the most unsatisfactory in the history of this municipality. The accounts showed, in fact, that the undertaking was unsound. The increased working expenses marched almost pound for pound with the increased revenue. The earning of increased revenue actually cost more in total expenditure.

The principal wrong in the minds of most citizens was that there should be such an undertaking as a municipal telephone at all, but it was contended by others that, if it is wise for the Government to have a telephone, and to be content with 1-34 as a Sinking-Fund, the Glasgow Corporation were doing better by putting aside 1-30. But the Corporation system has been now sold to the Post-office at a price which will leave a loss that will not be less than £15,000, and may be found to be as much

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

as £50,000 when all items are adjusted. The telephone system, the risks of which formed a charge upon the rates, was not a proper subject for municipal enterprise. It is a "utility" for an inconsiderable percentage of the population at the expense of the majority who do not use it at all.

The accounts of the Loans Department for the year ending May 31st, 1905, show that during the year 825 stock certificates and 1,791 temporary loan receipts were signed and 827 transfers of Corporation stock were registered, namely, 207 of 3½-per-cent. redeemable stock; 148 of 3½-per-cent. irredeemable stock; 124 of 3¼-per-cent. redeemable stock; 262 of 3-per-cent. redeemable stock; 25 of 2½-per-cent. redeemable stock, 1925-40; and 51 of 2½-per-cent. redeemable stock, 1910-25. Some 2,380 Mortgages were signed on behalf of the Corporation, and 54 transfers of Mortgages were registered. The Mortgage rate was reduced to £3 7*s.* 6*d.* and £3 5*s.* per cent. The total amount borrowed by the Loans Fund as at May 31st, 1905, was £11,790,044 17*s.* 3*d.*, an increase as compared with the total at May 31st, 1904, of £320,806 14*s.* 3*d.* The loans to the several Corporation Departments at the end of the financial year amounted to £11,635,091 5*s.* 7*d.* on capital account, and £120,000 on temporary loan. The total amount of the Sinking-Funds provided out of the annual revenue of the Corporation Departments and proceeds of sale of property paid into the Loans Fund during the year, was £303,125 7*s.* 6*d.* Further borrowing powers have been obtained for purposes of markets, for sewage purposes, and for gas purposes, in connection with the recent amalgamation of the burgh of Kinning Park with the city.

There is, beyond doubt, a considerable body of adverse opinion about the methods of finance in Glasgow, which may now be considered. They are based on the Glasgow Corporation Loans Act, 1883. On the 10th of July, 1900, an ex-Lord Provost was asked a question by the Chairman of the Joint Select Committee of Parliament on Municipal Trading: "What public enterprise does the Corporation of Glasgow undertake?" The answer was: "In addition to the ordinary Municipal departments, such as Police, Health, Parks, City Improvements, and so on, we do various non-rating enterprises, carried on apart from any rating security, those being markets and slaughter-houses, water-supply, gas-supply, tramways of the city and adjacent burghs, electric light

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

for the city, telephones for the city." The Parliamentary Select Committee was told that the Tramways, Electric Light, and Telephones were carried on "apart from any rating security." The tramways are, indeed, carried on "apart from any rating security," and are on the Common Good. The Electric Lighting Department and Telephones, however, are on the Loans Fund, and are carried on with full unlimited rating security.

The debts of the city (the Loans Fund) and the debts of the Departments to the Loans Fund are quite distinct: The Sinking-Funds are used in paying off the particular debts of the Departments to the Loans Fund. The Departments having borrowed from the Loans Fund are, no doubt, paying back to the Loans Fund, but the collective debt of the Departments to the Loans Fund is not reduced, as collectively they have reborrowed from the Loans Fund the money they have paid to it. The Sinking-Fund is supposed to be one which in a given number of years will pay off and redeem a given debt, but the debt of the city and the debts of the Departments are quite distinct. If the Sinking-Funds were invested in liquid securities they would require to be realized before they could be used to pay off debt, but being invested in Corporation non-liquid enterprises, the Sinking Funds cannot be used in paying off debt until the securities and enterprises are realized. It is difficult to say what the securities would be worth in forced liquidation.

The Glasgow method of managing its loans is peculiar. The treasurer in charge of the Loans Fund practically acts as cashier for the various enterprises. He receives the Sinking-Fund payments from one Department and lends them to another Department. When a terminable loan becomes due, the Sinking-Fund exists as an investment in non-realizable securities, having been lent out again in some other Corporation venture. The Glasgow system of finance has been characterized by one of its citizens as "one constant borrowing and never repaying."

The Corporation Tramway accounts are very well kept. The objections taken to these accounts are not against them, but against the financial lines upon which the undertaking is carried on. The prosperity of the Glasgow tramways cannot be questioned, and the management is excellent. It is the pet scheme of the Glasgow Corporation, and in order to increase the profits of it every difficulty has been removed. It is considered by some citizens that

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the Statute Labor Department (which takes care of the streets) is burdened in order to cheapen the permanent way for the Tramways Department. The rounding of corners and widening of streets is generally paid for by private tramway companies, but the Glasgow Tramway Department gets this work done free. All the municipal undertakings in Glasgow are upon the rates, except the tramways. If the tramways result in loss the "Common Good" or capital would be liable. *Per contra,* the profits do not come in relief of rates.

The water-supply is admirable, and the whole enterprise splendidly engineered. The Gas undertaking is fairly prosperous, and wholly efficient. The Electric Lighting hardly manages to pay its way; and the Telephones Department was a huge blunder.

It is the complaint of financiers that the Corporation is liable at a month's notice to pay two millions sterling borrowed from sundry persons, which is not a satisfactory state of affairs. The Ratepayers' Federation of Glasgow look upon municipal trading as a national danger to be guarded against, especially with regard to finance and in regard to the likelihood of fettering individual effort.

The Cleansing Committee of the Corporation of Glasgow recently acquired Ryding, Maryburgh and Robroyston estates on the northeastern confines of Greater Glasgow—a remarkable extension of communal property. One object in view in purchasing these estates was to provide an outlet for city refuse, which could not be disposed of otherwise. Another was to provide better feeding for the stud of horses used in the cleansing and other departments of the municipal service. Before the lands were acquired by the Cleansing Committee, there was no alternative but to lay the refuse in depots all round the outskirts of the city, especially during the summer months. This was a menace to the health of the citizens. Cremating-furnaces were then introduced and gradually extended, until now there are six destruction stations with 58 cells, capable of destroying over 50 tons of refuse daily. These furnaces were not sufficient to deal with the enormous quantity of refuse produced in the city, and the necessity arose for acquiring land in the near country to which the surplus material could be sent. The Committees started by leasing land, but afterwards they decided to buy land outright. In 1891, they acquired the Ryding estate, and more recently two

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

adjacent farms were added, and in 1894 Maryburgh was purchased. The most recent addition to the landed property of this Department is the estate of Robroyston, purchased two years ago. Besides giving the Cleansing Department facilities for the tipping of refuse and the growing of crops, the Health Department has taken a portion of this ground for the erection of a small-pox hospital, while accommodation has also been provided for the Sewage Committee to tip sludge. The total area of the committee's estates is 1,710 acres, of which 1,509 acres are the property of the Corporation and 192 acres are held on lease. Five of the farms are at present leased to tenants, but of four of these the leases expire within the next twelve months, when the Cleansing Committee will have to work them. On behalf of the Cleansing Committee it is claimed that it was only within the past five-and-twenty years that the people of large cities have realized that one of the greatest things they have to deal with is their own dirt. The Cleansing Committee of the Corporation of Glasgow, therefore, attacked that problem, and resolved that all the dirt of the city, so far as it was in a solid form, should vanish from the city within twenty-four hours, and should be disposed of so as not to injure other people. This, then, is an enterprise in which some profit may be possible in a pecuniary sense, but which was necessary in a communal sense. It is not, therefore, to be regarded as a mere example of actual municipal trading.

As an example of the craze for further municipalization in Glasgow, let us now take a recent scheme proposed for a Corporation Works Department. It was proposed in the Town Council,

> "That it be remitted to a special committee to consider and report on the expediency of instituting, in the public interest, a works Department of the Corporation, whose committee shall be charged with carrying out, by its own workmen in the pay of the Corporation, the whole work that at present is executed for the Corporation by private contractors."

This was a large order, and it was claimed that the motion did not introduce a new principle, as the Corporation already have several sectional works departments. The success of the works department of the tramways, for instance, was cited in support of the proposal, and tailoring was mentioned as a branch of industry in which the Corporation could effect a great saving by executing its own work. Another element in the case was the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

allegation that the Corporation had difficulty in getting contractors to pay the "standard" rate of wages, and in preserving the adjustment of the "fair conditions" under which they gave out Corporation contracts. It was also claimed that, while the contractors' estimates for the Clydebank intercepting sewer amounted to £119,000, the work was done by the Corporation for £78,000, or a saving of about £41,000. It was argued, on the other hand, that it is more economical to let out work to contractors, because of contingencies that might arise. The proposal was resisted on the ground that a more dangerous motion for the city of Glasgow and for the ratepayers never had been brought forward.

The idea of having a clothing department means that the Corporation would have to make their own police clothing, the tramway uniforms, their hats, underclothing, and then have a mill for the manufacture of the cloth that would be required. The Tramways Department started, not to make cars, but to repair cars, and from that it was an easy step to building them. The Town Council should be free to face emergencies, and to decide, when occasion arises, whether they will do certain work themselves or give it out to a contractor. Otherwise, they might as well establish engine-shops, lease quarries, open brick-fields cement works, and purchase the foreshore of the ocean to get sand.

The motion asked the Corporation to do everything for everybody, as if what was wanted was a huge Cooperative Society, or an imitation Tammany Hall. The electorate of the city numbers 150,000 voters, of whom 15,000, or one-tenth, are employees of the Corporation. If the number of Corporation employees was to be increased, the only relief from corruption would be in their disfranchisement. It was alleged, in debate on the motion, that the municipalization of the water and gas supplies was identical with this proposal. But these were necessities of the community, and they were previously held as monopolies by private companies. The hands of the Corporation are sufficiently full without adventuring upon this proposed new enterprise, and happily the motion was rejected.

But this did not discourage the "progressives," who on another occasion moved: "That it be remitted to a committee to consider the advisability of the Corporation undertaking the man-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ufacture, in their own workshops, of clothing required by the various departments for their employees." This motion was commended to the Corporation at a time when they were in a dilemma regarding the police-clothing contract. The total value of the clothing manufactured for the various Departments runs from £10,000 to £12,000. The proposal was supported on the ground that it was based on a desire to keep the manufacture of their own clothing within the city. But where would Glasgow be but for the trade she does with all the world? The citizens should be very careful of any attempt to try to limit manufacture within the city. The whole tailoring scheme was in the nature of a movement to create Socialistic conditions of wages and hours of labor. It was properly characterized as "silly," because there is a clear and distinct dividing-line between what the Corporation had previously municipalized and this proposal. The friends of the motion wanted the Corporation to municipalize everything and to drive out private enterprise. This motion was negatived, but the promoters of it are not effaced.

The decision of the Glasgow Town Council against municipal tailoring workshops has invited comparison with modern industrial methods of the most successful kind. Formerly it was considered good business for every firm to specialize on its own particular article. To-day, the tendency is for the big undertakings to be self-contained. A large ship-building firm may control everything from the coal and iron mines up to the battle-ship, including even photography and upholstery. A railway company may make wooden legs for its disabled servants; provide hotels for its passengers; and supply a steamboat service which drives private steamboat-owners off the river. A packing-house firm in America finds it necessary, under modern conditions, to manufacture sausages, bristles, glue, felt, candles, soap, table condiments and manure; to own the rolling-stock which it uses; to protect itself from competition by acquiring railroads and organizing transport in several cities; to open retail shops; to insure itself, and, through a bank of its own, to conduct its own financial business. Some members of the Town Council think that Glasgow should follow the same methods. It is too late in the day, they cry, to shout the bogey of Socialism.

There are certain aspects of this question on which more light is needed, such, for instance, as the effect of an indefinite increase

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

of the position of the municipality as an employer of labor in its own constituency. No questions more perplexing arise in Parliament than those with which are connected members returned to the House of Commons by constituents paid by the state. The danger there induces suspicion of the employment by the community as a whole within the constituencies. Municipal bodies may be tempted by pressure to actions that are not for the common good. While municipalities are dealing with such things as water-supply, cleansing, paving of streets, and so forth, there is no great probability that the progress of invention and knowledge will be retarded, or that it will render useless any of the expenditure in which they indulge. There is not the same certainty in gas and some other enterprise in which municipalities engage. No one can say with certainty, for instance, that gas will for all time retain its place as a source of light, heat and power. As to tramways, great changes are even now going on, and no one can say that a fixed line of tramway is the permanent form of transit from one street centre to another, and from the centre of crowded areas to the exterior. There are, certainly, doubts about the commercial future of many commercial undertakings in which municipalities are engaged. In private enterprise, when inventions render antiquated vast capital expenditure, a company winds up its affairs, and a new system takes the place of the old one. But a municipality which has embarked the ratepayers' money in, say, some mode of road transit which becomes superseded by some new method more convenient, will find that it has wasted millions of the ratepayers' money. The tramway methods of twenty years ago are already antiquated; will the tramway methods of to-day be antiquated ten years hence?

While Glasgow is, as has been said, a well-managed city, as cities go, its citizens are by no means unanimous in approval of the management of its affairs. These affairs are in the hands of representatives elected periodically by the ratepayers in the Wards, each representative being seated for three years and eligible for reelection without limit. While it is true that many able and shrewd business men are sent to the Town Council, it is also true that a great many are sent there without the mental grasp or experience to deal with such weighty matters as the Town Council has to control. Men accustomed to small trans-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

actions in their own business will quarrel fiercely over some proposal to add £50 a year to the salary of a deserving official, and will then blindly vote for some project that may add a million to the debt of the city. Such men will propose capital expenditure that will please their Wards, without knowing, or at all events without appearing to consider, that capital expenditure must ultimately fall upon the ratepayer in some form.

To make the water-supply of Glasgow a municipal enterprise was at the time a matter of necessity, in the interests of public health. And because the water-supply and the tramway system are so much admired by outsiders, the opinion has developed in certain sections of the community that the Corporation of Glasgow can do everything it undertakes much better than private enterprise can do. It is this delusion, strongly reflected in the Council Chamber, that is the great source of danger to the community. It is shared by many able men who ought to know better. To one of the ablest and most efficient men who ever occupied the Lord Provost's Chair, Glasgow owes the wretched burden of the telephone system. This very able Lord Provost had Socialistic proclivities and a masterful way of his own. Acting, as he thought, for the best, he practically forced the telephone system on to the Corporation—and the ratepayers are left to pay the piper.

In the matter of municipal trading, Glasgow well exemplifies what Professor Shield Nicholson recently set before the Institute of Bankers in Scotland. He said that municipal trading covers all the operations of any local authority which, if undertaken by a private company, will be expected to yield a profit. It excludes many forms of municipal enterprise which requires large capital outlay and involves an annual charge—such as poorhouses and asylums, public parks, municipal buildings, etc., in which municipal enterprise is rather to be compared with private benevolence than with private trading. With the progress of society an increase of municipal expenditure for these purposes is to be expected, and this militates against Local Authorities taking over other functions which can be adequately performed by associations or individuals. In all branches of industry there has been an increasing tendency to production on a large scale, and for amalgamation, shown not only in manufactures but in transport and distribution. The creation of Trusts and Cartels shows

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

how excessive competition and production on a large scale tend to facilitate the growth of industrial monopolies. But whenever monopolies arise, some kind of state control is necessary in the interests of the public. When monopoly arises from natural combination, state regulation is not easy, and the idea has been encouraged that the state, either by central or local authority, should take monopolies into its own hands.

Municipal trading is monopoly and is advocated on the ground that the monopoly will prove a convenient source of revenue; and that the interests of the public will be promoted by its better management. But if the prime object is profit, then the price is fixed higher than it need be, and the consumers are taxed to the extent of the monopoly revenue. There can never be much surplus revenue from municipal trading itself, and what there is will be of the nature of a tax. In estimating the profit on municipal trading, allowance must be made for all the expenses that would be involved if in private hands. By the omission of these elements the net gain of municipal enterprise is made to seem larger than it really is. Municipal trading, too, is almost entirely carried on on borrowed capital, and there may be a fall in the value of the capital invested either through improvements in the methods of supply, or through changes in demand—or through the decay or stagnation of the locality. And when municipal trading is successful, there is generally a tendency to routine; and there is also the danger, as Professor Nicholson says, of extravagance and other abuses of an "expanding and vainglorious bureaucracy."

Thus, while Glasgow presents to the world some things which afford to other cities and countries a good example, she also affords in many other things a warning. Between her splendid water-supply and prosperous tramways, and her woful telephone business, there are many lines to read.

BENJAMIN TAYLOR.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE TRUTH ABOUT THE ELIZABETHAN PLAYWRIGHTS.

BY BRANDER MATTHEWS, PROFESSOR OF DRAMATIC LITERATURE IN COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY.

THERE is no denying that the dominant characteristic of the English-speaking race is energy, and that this energy never expressed itself in literature more completely than it did in the later years of Elizabeth's reign. There was then the most abundant revelation of the power and passion of this sturdy people, the most magnificent luxuriance of its essential imagination, and a sudden outflowering of the vigor of a hardy and prolific stock. And above all the turmoil of those spacious days there towered aloft the genius of Shakespeare. Small wonder is it that many lovers of literature have been blinded by the effulgence of all this genius and have closed their eyes to all except its glory, unable to perceive anything but absolute perfection. So long have we made a habit of using a megaphone to proclaim its manifest and manifold beauties, that a microphone would suffice for our infrequent and unwilling admissions that all was not equally faultless in this splendid era. I can still recall the shock of surprise with which—when I was yet an undergraduate in college—I came across a passage in one of Matthew Arnold's essays seeming to suggest that there might be weak places in Shakespeare's works, and that even his genius did not always maintain him at the topmost pinnacle of transcendent achievement.

But to adopt an attitude of insistent admiration is to renounce the privilege and the duty of criticism, as Gautier did when he declared that, if ever he found a single line of Hugo's to fall short in any way, he would not confess it to himself alone, in a cellar, on a dark night. We deny ourselves the pleasure of knowing wherein the Elizabethan poets are truly mighty, if we give

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

them all credit for all possible excellence, or if we carelessly fail to see clearly that even the mightiest of them does not always sustain himself at his highest level. The work of the great Elizabethans is what it is; and for that we love it. But also it is not what it is not; and we ought to be honest enough not to claim for it the qualities which it lacks, and which it could not have because they are inconsistent with those it actually has. Largeness of vision it has, and depth of insight, and the gift of life itself, and many another manifestation of the energy of the race. These possessions are beyond question; and yet, because it possesses these qualities, because it has sweep, and penetration, youthful daring and robust vitality, it is often violent, often trivial, often grotesque. Reckless and ill-restrained, it is likely to be wanting in taste and lacking in logic. Energy it has above all things else, and a compelling imaginative fire; but balance and proportion it rarely reveals. Only infrequently do we find symmetry and harmony,—qualities seemingly incompatible with the wastefulness of effort always characteristic of this masterful people.

More than any other group of the Elizabethans, have the dramatists suffered from this practice of indiscriminate praise and from the absence of measured appreciation. Sometimes it seems as though the commentators have chosen wilfully to shut their eyes to everything they would wish away. They have made no effort to free themselves from the spell of Lamb's contagious enthusiasm; and they have not resisted the evil influence of the extravagant eulogy habitual with Mr. Swinburne, whose overpowering rhetoric once bade fair to have as pernicious an effect on literary criticism as Ruskin's overpowering rhetoric had for a while upon pictorial criticism. As Ruskin misled many and discouraged more, who, under wiser guidance, might have learned in time to take keen pleasure in the painter's art, so Swinburne by his indiscriminate overpraise must have repelled many a reader who might have been lured into a liking for the real value of the Elizabethan dramatic poets, if this had been modestly set forth.

Many commentators and critics yield themselves up to be hypnotized by the dramatic poet they are dealing with, crediting him with a host of merits and refusing to counterbalance their commendation by allowing weight even to such demerits as they are compelled to record. An amusing instance of this abdication of

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the critical function can be found in the introduction to "Old Fortunatus" in the Temple Dramatists, in which the editor is permitted to say that this comedy of Dekker's, "though containing numberless faults in construction, in weak and ineffective character-drawing, and in improbable psychological deduction, is nevertheless one of the greatest of Elizabethan dramas." Surely, this is the very negation of criticism, to call a piece containing "numberless faults" one of the "greatest of dramas." Such writing is disheartening, not to term it dishonest. The truth is that "Old Fortunatus" is only a narrative in dialogue, and it has little dramaturgic merit; its character-drawing is mere prentice-work; and it pleases because of its primitive unpretentiousness and its fleeting glimpses of poetry. It has none of the broad humor or of the hearty veracity of character which lends charm to Dekker's "Shoemaker's Holiday," a brisk comedy of the contemporary life of London which the sturdy author knew so well and relished so keenly.

In considering the lack of play-making skill, abundantly evident in the works of the Elizabethan poets, two points must ever be borne in mind. The first of these is that the literary form which happens to be popular and therefore profitable, in any period, attracts to it many who have little or no native gift for that special art. In the nineteenth century, for example, the vogue of the novel was overwhelming; and many a man of letters, who had but a small share of the narrative faculty, undertook to express himself in fiction. So, at the end of the sixteenth century, the drama was the one field in which an aspiring genius might hope to make money; and it is not surprising, therefore, to find only a few among all the mass of Elizabethan dramatic poets who either were born playrights, or who took the trouble, by dint of hard work, to master the secrets of the craft. Marlowe, for one, had no natural bent toward the theatre; and Webster, for another, for all his striving after the horrible, does not prove his possession of the native endowment of the instinctive playmaker. Marlowe and Webster were poets, beyond all question; they were richly endowed with imagination; but they were not born playwrights.

The second point to be kept in memory is that the dramatic art was not highly esteemed in Elizabeth's time. The theatre was a means whereby a poet might earn his living; but plays

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

were not held to be literature; they were devised only to satisfy the three hours' traffic of the stage; they were looked down upon by men of letters, much as journalism is looked down upon to-day. Accustomed as we are to consider the drama as the chief glory of Elizabethan literature, we do not always remember that the Elizabethans themselves scarcely held it to be literature at all. Nothing is more significant of this contemporary opinion than the fact that Shakespeare corrected the proof of his two narrative poems carefully, while he gave no thought to the printing of his plays, carelessly abandoning the manuscripts to his comrades of the theatre. One result of this contemptuous attitude toward the drama was that the poet was not held to any high standard, and that what was good enough for the rude play-going public of those turbulent times was often good enough for the playwright himself.

Perhaps it is well also to note a third point, the recalling of which will help us to understand certain of the dramaturgic deficiencies of those days; and this is that the drama had not yet come into its own. It was still imperfectly differentiated; it had not disengaged itself from elements wholly undramatic. Just as the Greek drama in the time of Æschylus retained a lyrical element which often delayed the movement of the play itself, so the English drama in the time of Shakespeare had not purged itself of functions which had nothing to do with the setting of a story on the stage. It needs to be remembered that, in those early days, the theatre was not only the theatre; it was also, to a certain extent, the newspaper, the lecture-hall and even the pulpit. So it is that we find the dramatic poet sometimes halting his plot to deliver a lecture or a sermon, which his audience received gladly, but which clogged the movement of his action, and which is seen now to be a hindrance to the artistic shaping of his plot.

Here we touch the connection between the drama as it was under Elizabeth and the drama as it had been under Henry VIII and his predecessors. There is close kinship between the mysteries and miracle-plays of the Middle Ages and the masterpieces of Marlowe and even of Shakespeare. The outward form of the drama is always conditioned by the actual theatre in which it is performed and to which it has to be adjusted. The unroofed playhouses of London in 1600 were wholly unlike our snug

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

modern theatres; and the conditions of the performances therein were very like those under which the mysteries had been acted. A modern theatre is roofed and artificially lighted; it has a stage, shut off by a drop-curtain and made more illusive by scenery. An Elizabethan playhouse was open to the air; it got its light from the sky; its stage, encumbered with spectators, had no drop-curtain and no scenery; its methods were those of the mystery performed in the market-place and the churchyard. There is really very little difference in structure between the miracle-play of the later Middle Ages and the chronicle-play of Elizabeth's youth. If the method of the elder is mediæval, the method of the younger is semimediæval, to say the least. It could not be anything else until the roofed and lighted theatre came into being, with its separating drop-curtain and its realistic scenery. There was no modern theatre in London until after the Restoration; and so it is that the Elizabethan drama could not be modern; it had to remain at least semimediæval even in its loftiest efforts. It was not the fault of the Elizabethan drama that it had not the severe simplicity of the ancients or the neat dexterity of the moderns; but there is no denying that it had neither, and that it could not have them.

In every epoch when the drama has flourished,—in Athens in the days of Sophocles, in Madrid in the days of Lope de Vega, in London in the days of Shakespeare and in Paris in the days of Molière,—the dramatists have always adjusted their plays to the special theatre in which these were to be performed and to the special audience before whom these were to be acted. The severe drama of Sophocles is not shaped in closer accord with the conditions of the huge theatre of Dionysos than is the tumultuous drama of Shakespeare fitted to the wholly different conditions of the rude Globe Theatre. And when we consider what were the actual circumstances of performance in the Globe Theatre, our wonder is not that the structure of Shakespeare's plays is often straggling and slovenly, but rather that the great dramatist was ever able to attain to a more seemly conduct of his plot, such as he did achieve in "Othello" and in "Macbeth." Perhaps, indeed, there is no better proof of the might of Shakespeare's genius than this,—that now and again he was able to overcome conditions which seem to be unconquerable, and to produce a play which endures for all time even though it was originally adjusted

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

adroitly to the circumstances of performance upon a semi-mediæval stage.

Furthermore, the Elizabethan dramatist not only put his plays together in conformity with the customary methods of representation that obtained in the Elizabethan theatre, he also kept in mind always the audience before which they were to be produced. It was for the playgoer of the present that he exerted himself; it was not for the reader of the future. It was the playgoer he had to please; and for the playwright there is never any appeal from the verdict of the playhouse itself. As those "who live to please, must please to live," the playwright is ever dependent upon the public of his own time and of his own town.

The absence of standards and the contemporary contempt of the acted drama, account for many of the defects of the plays of that renowned period; but the chief cause is ever to be sought in the necessity of pleasing a special public, probably far more brutal in its longings than any other to which a great dramatist has had to appeal. The Athenians, for whom Sophocles built his massive and austere tragedies, and the Parisians, for whom Molière painted the humorous portrait of our common humanity,—these were quite other than the mob before whom Shakespeare had to set his studies from life, a mob stout of stomach for sheer horrors and shrinking from no atrocity. It is the Elizabethan public which is mainly responsible for the fact that the Elizabethan drama, glorious as it is with splendid episodes, taken separately, has only a few masterpieces, only a few plays the conduct of which does not continually disappoint even a cordial reader. As M. Jusserand has pointed out, with the calm sanity which is characteristic of French criticism, it is not difficult to select many "luminous parts, scenes brilliant or tragic, moving passages, characters solidly set on their feet," but it is very rare indeed to find complete wholes sustained as a lofty level of art, "plays entirely satisfactory, strongly conceived, firmly knit together, carried to an inevitable conclusion."

Why take the trouble to knit a story strongly and to deduce its inevitable conclusion, when the public the play had to please cared nothing for this artistic victory? Not only did the playgoers of those days find no fault with the lack of plausibility in the conduct of the story, with sudden and impossibly quick changes in character, with coincidences heaped up and with arbitrary

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

artificialities accumulated; but these, indeed, were the very qualities they most enjoyed. They preferred the unusual, the unexpected, the illogical; and it was to behold startling turns of fortune and to get the utmost of surprise that they went to the theatre. To us in the twentieth century it seems strangely unnatural that the jealousy of Leontes should flame up violently and almost without pretext: but to them in the sixteenth century this was a pleasure. To us there is annoyance in the huddling of two and three several stories into a single play, wholly unconnected, the joyous and the gruesome side by side, and in no wise tied together; but to them this was entirely satisfactory, for it gave them variety, and this was what they were seeking. Where we like to find the finger of fate pointing out the inevitable end, they would rather have the climax brought about by the long arm of coincidence; and this is the reason why we must be ready to "make believe," when we surrender ourselves to the charm of these semimediæval poet playwrights. We must be willing to adventure ourselves in a maze of unreality, in a false world differing widely from the real world in which we live and in which cause must go before effect.

No doubt, there were gallants sitting on the stage who had some tincture of cultivation; and there must have been other men of some education in the rooms of the gallery. But the most of those who stood in the yard below were unable to write or to read. Among them were discharged soldiers home from the wars, sailors from the ships of Frobisher and Drake, runaway apprentices and all the riffraff and rabble of a seaport town which happens also to be the capital of an expanding nation. They were violent in their likings, with a constant longing for horse-play and ribaldry, and with a persistent hankering after scenes of lust and gore. They were used to cock-fighting and bear-baiting and bull-baiting; and these brutal sports were shown sometimes within the very building where on other occasions there were performances of those raw tragedies-of-blood, the sole plays on the stage which could stir the nerves of such a public. These supporters of the stage were used to battle, murder and sudden death, not only in the theatre, but in daily life, for there were scores of public executions every year; and in those spectacular times the headsman of the Tower was a busy man, with his ghastly trophies frequently renewed on the spikes of the gate.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The pressure of the main body of playgoers upon the playwrights was not unwholesome then, as it is not unwholesome now, in so far as it led the dramatic poets to avoid preciosity and to eschew style-mongering; in so far as it forced them to deal directly with life, and to handle passion boldly and amply. But the playgoers of those days had cruder likings also; they craved constant excitement, both for the eye and for the ear; and the aspiring playwright gave them good measure, pressed down and running over. For the pleasure of the eye, he lavished processions, coronations, funerals, encampments, single combats and serried battles. For the pleasure of the ear, he was prolific of songs, melancholy or smutty; and he never stinted such other sounds as he could command, the roll of the drum, the staccato call of the trumpet, the clangor of loud bells, the rattle of musketry and the long reverberation of thunder. Sheeted ghosts and bloody spectres were sure of their welcome in advance; and the playwright was prompt to produce them whenever he had an excuse. He knew also that these ignorant playgoers had a rough sense of fun and liked to laugh heartily; and so he sprinkled throughout his pieces a variety of ingenious retorts and of obvious repartees, even descending now and again to get his laugh by the more mechanical humor of a practical joke. Furthermore, he was aware that, gross as was the taste of the yardlings, they could enjoy pretty sentiment, sometimes presented with simple truth, and sometimes surcharged with the utmost of lyric exaggeration.

When we consider how rank was the quality of those who stood in the yard of the Globe in those days, how deficient their education, how harsh their experience of life, how rude their likings, the wonder is not that the play prepared for their pleasure was often violent and arbitrary and coarse, but rather that any play devised to delight them was ever logical and elevated, shapely and refined. If the best of Shakespeare is for eternity, the worst of him was frankly for the groundlings who were his contemporaries, and whose interest he had to arouse and to retain as best he could. It is evidence of the intense practicality which ever directed his conduct that he was in the habit of taking over old plays which had already proved their power to attract paying audiences. It is evidence of his strict adaptation of his plays to his semimediæval audiences that he had a total disregard of

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

chronological, historic or geographic accuracy, giving clocks and cannons to the Romans and having the Italians going from Milan to Venice take ship when the tide served, because this was the mode of travel most familiar to the Londoner then. It is evidence of his understanding of his public that he is open in having his villains proclaim their own wickedness, so that the spectator might never be in doubt as to their motives.

In nothing else is the superiority of Shakespeare over his contemporaries more obvious than in the adroit dexterity with which he played upon the prejudices of his audience and made profit out of them. He sought always to give the spectators of his own time what he knew they wanted; and yet, now and again, perhaps a dozen times in the score of years of his play-making, uplifted by his genius and by his love of his craft, he looked above the spectators and beyond them, and he took a trouble they did not require of him. On these occasions, all too few, he made a play, pleasing to them indeed, but also pleasing to himself, and to his own intense artistic enjoyment of technical mastery. So it happens that we have the compact and logical "Othello," as well as the sprawling and incoherent "Cymbeline," which came long after.

The most of his contemporaries, brilliant as they were and highly gifted, were incapable of this, and they were unable to profit by the example Shakespeare had set them in those of his plays in which he was himself interested enough to do his best and to put forth his full strength. It is because he is at his best only on occasion, and when the spirit of perfection moved him, that he founded no school. He was not a master to follow unhesitatingly, partly because the mark at which he aimed was not always the best target for others, since he was willing often to let the incomparable felicity of the poet cover up and cloak the careless planning of the playwright; and partly also because no weaker arm could bend the bow of Ulysses. His chief gift was uncommunicable; it was the power of endowing all his creatures with independent life. This power is the test of his work; and it never leaves him. We discover it abundantly even in his most recklessly arbitrary plots, and even in those of his episodes which are based on a childish make-believe. It is not to the credit of critics, like Brandes, that they gloss over the absurdities that abound in Shakespeare's plays because Shake-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

speare was ready enough to give the spectators of his own time the puerile devices they delighted in,—the pound of flesh and the trial of the caskets in the "Merchant of Venice," for example, and the test of the affection of Lear's daughter, when that fatherly monarch, unless he was already imbecile, ought to have learned the characters of his children in the long years of their family-life. If a critic does not see these absurdities, if he is blind to the arbitrary and muddled plot of "Cymbeline" and to the shocking callousness of the last act of "Much Ado about Nothing," then we may well doubt whether he is really able to appreciate the masterly simplicity of "Othello" and the orderly richness of "Romeo and Juliet."

The significant fact is that Shakespeare was, after all, an Elizabethan; and that, like the others, he had to accept the conditions of a semimediæval theatre and to please a full-blooded public. The others cannot climb with him; but not infrequently he sinks with them. They were ready enough to be satisfied themselves when they had satisfied the playgoers of their own day. They had no hesitation in sacrificing consistency of character to immediate effect on the mass of spectators,—very much as their fellow playwrights in Spain were doing at the same time and for the same reason. Climbing to impossible heights of honor or sinking to impossible depths of dishonor, abounding in the most romantic reversals of fortune and in the most inexplicable transformations of character, caring little for reality or even for plausibility, disregarding the delicacy of art no less than the veracity of nature, they were fertile in inventing striking episodes; and they failed, as a rule, to combine the several parts into a coherent whole, sustaining itself throughout and gathering power as it proceeded. Capable on occasion of the finest shadings of a subtle psychology, they were content for the most part with a bald daubing of character in the primary colors. In other words, they often proved themselves true poets, but far less frequently did they reveal themselves as real playwrights.

This is the reason why the flamboyant and iridescent eulogy of Swinburne is doing them an ill service to-day, while they gained greatly by the apt selection of Lamb, who artfully singled out the perfect passages. Only too often the parts are far finer than the whole; and Lamb presented the best bits so enticingly that he must have lured to disappointment many readers who

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

went straight from his "Specimens" to the complete works of the several dramatic poets. Here also we may find an excuse for Hazlitt and for Lowell, who have praised these poets more especially as poets to be read in a library, while almost wholly neglecting to consider their plays as plays intended to be performed by actors in a theatre and before an audience. To Hazlitt and Lowell, these dramatic poets appealed primarily as poets; and that the poets were dramatists also rarely arrested the attention of either of these acute critics.

Of a certainty, there must be many other readers who are willing enough to follow the example of Hazlitt and of Lowell and to accept the pure poetry which is abundant in the works of the Elizabethan dramatists without caring to consider whether or not the plays enriched by this poetry are all that they ought to be merely as plays. Some of them may even be inclined to resent any attempt to call attention to the dramaturgic defects of plays possessing a host of splendid passages wherein poetry combines with psychology to give the keenest pleasure. Others there are who are willing to admit the existence of the defects themselves, but who deny the justice of a criticism which gauges the semimediæval playwrights by tests properly applicable only to the modern drama. This protest was voiced most persuasively not long ago by a devout admirer of the old dramatists who insisted on the impropriety of judging Marlowe and Massinger by the standards proper enough in judging Scribe and Ibsen.

There is a certain speciousness in this claim; but analysis shows that it was not valid. It may be unfair to weigh the semimediæval Marlowe and Massinger on the same scales as Scribe and Ibsen, who are moderns; but it is not unfair to measure them by the standards we can derive from the comparison of the greatest dramatists, both ancient and modern. If we find certain principles of the art of play-making exemplified in the best dramas of Æschylus and of Sophocles, of Shakespeare and of Molière, of Calderon and of Racine, of Beaumarchais and of Scribe, of Ibsen, of Sudermann and of Pinero, it is not unfair to consider these as the eternal verities of dramaturgy, and to point out that Marlowe and Massinger fail to achieve an excellence of which we find frequent examples all through the long history of the drama, some of them a score of centuries before Scribe and Ibsen were born.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

At its best, the dramatist's art reveals itself as akin to the architect's; and a really good play ought to have a solid framework and a bold simplicity of planning, with a foundation broad enough to sustain the superstructure, however massive or however lofty this may prove to be. It ought to have unity of theme, freedom from all extraneous matter, veracity of motive, contrast of character, clearness of exposition, probability of incident, logical coherence, swift movement and culminating intensity of interest. These qualities can be found in "Agamemnon" and "Œdipus the King," as well as in "Othello" and in "Tartuffe," in the "Alcalde of Zalamea" and in "Phèdre," in the "Barber of Seville" and in the "Ladies' Battle," in "Ghosts," in "Magda" and in the "Second Mrs. Tanqueray." But these qualities are not to be found in any large degree in "Doctor Faustus" or in the "Roman Actor"; and they are not often to be found in the plays of any of the Elizabethan dramatists,—far more often in Shakespeare than in any of the others.

And if these deficiencies exist, surely it is unwise to close our eyes to the fact; surely it is unjust to pretend that the Elizabethan drama, as a whole, possesses that which it has not; surely it is safer and honester to admit frankly that the art of building plays solidly and symmetrically was little cultivated by the Elizabethan dramatists, just as it was little considered by the Elizabethan critics. Surely, again, it is wisest to try to see things as they really are and to tell the truth about them, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth. Even in criticism, honesty is the best policy; and the Elizabethan poets are indisputably great enough to make it worth while for us to assure ourselves wherein their true greatness lies. They are none the less great as poets when we have seen clearly that—excepting Shakespeare—they are great as playwrights only occasionally, and almost, as it were, by accident.

BRANDER MATTHEWS.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

TRUSTS.

BY ALBERT STICKNEY.

"TRUSTS." What are they? What are their evils?

A "trust," as nearly as one can understand the current use of the term, is a large combination of capital in the hands of a corporation, or of a combination of corporations. The term is not applied to large combinations of capital in the hands of individuals, or of an ordinary partnership; but to those unusually large accumulations of millions, and hundreds of millions, in the hands of corporations.

What are the evils of these combinations?

It must be conceded that corporations do have their uses. A corporation is merely an artificial person, a device of the law, created for the sake of aggregating small amounts of capital for large enterprises, under a single ownership, and for securing continuity of control. They are an absolute necessity for the business world. Especially, they are a necessity for the small investor, for persons who cannot venture to expose large amounts of money to the risks of loss in single enterprises; for persons who find it incumbent on them to avoid having "all their eggs in one basket."

Above all things, however, they are absolutely indispensable to the successful prosecution of the large undertakings of our vast modern industries. Individual fortunes do not provide capital in sufficiently large amounts.

Particularly is this the case in a new country, such as ours has been until very recently. The most useful institutions in our modern life are the corporations which have been formed for the prosecution of two most important public ends, education and transportation. Our public schools, our colleges and universities, cannot exist without the accumulation in single hands, under continuous control, of large amounts of money, large charitable

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

foundations; which make it possible to combine a large number of contributions from the charitably inclined, and invest them in libraries, laboratories, and funds for professorships, with all the other machineries of the modern educational world. So, too, with our machinery of transportation—our early plank-roads and our railroads. It was impossible to secure their construction, or their operation, without the use of corporations, which enabled the small investors to combine their individual contributions of capital. Thus only was it made possible to construct our railroads and other public highways, which are the arteries and veins for the transmission of our industrial blood, by which only are trade and commerce made possible. Furthermore, it would be an impossibility to carry on the large volumes of the transactions in our modern business world without the agencies of banks; which are the public highways for the transportation of money, and credit; carrying both where they are needed; diffusing both from the great financial centres to the industrial frontiers; and then, in turn, bringing back the manufactured products which constitute the results. It is easily seen, then, that corporations cannot be condemned by wholesale; that they are a vital necessity of our modern industrial existence.

What, then, are their evils?

Many thoughtful men, in recent years, have been appalled by the large figures of the capital which is concentrated in single hands, through the agency of separate corporations, or of several corporations which are "affiliated," as the phrase is, under a single control.

Is there a real substantial danger in this concentration?

Here, the first point that strikes our attention is that capital, in order to yield income, which is essential if it is to serve the mere moneyed interests of its owners, must of necessity be employed in some way that is beneficial to the community. It cannot be kept idle. Nor can it be applied to uses that are not beneficial, that will not "pay." Useless investments will not yield income. Money, in order to earn interest, must be used in industries that are beneficial. It must be used in "business"—that is, in the production of goods and merchandise that are in demand for the uses of the community; or in the transportation of such goods and merchandise from the producer to the user. There is no other way in which capital can be made to yield a profit to its owner.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Consequently, every capitalist is under compulsion, from the laws of industry and commerce, to invest his capital in ways which are useful to the community, and which give employment to the community's workers.

Moreover, the capitalist is, in the long run, compelled to invest his capital in ways that are approved by other men. Every large capitalist is under the necessity of investing his money through the agencies of the banks and the large corporations. If he invests through the banks, his money is loaned to business men for business enterprises. If he puts it into shares, or bonds, of some corporation, it goes directly into the business of that corporation. In any event, his capital must go into the veins and arteries of the business world, must form part of our industrial blood, if it is to yield income. So the practical result is, that the capitalist, under the immutable laws of industry and commerce, is under the supreme necessity of using his capital in the promotion of enterprises that are approved by the judgment of other men. Emerson somewhere says that men are seldom so wisely employed as when they are "making money." The reason is simple and plain; when they are "making money," they are giving employment to the honest and industrious working-men, and are contributing in the best possible way to the community's well-being. We hear much said of the capitalist's selfishness. Men must be selfish. If a man does not look out for himself, he will go down. Of course, the capitalist is selfish. He must invest in ways that will yield a profit to himself, if he is to serve successfully the interests of either himself or the community.

Then we come to another fact. The rates of compensation to the capitalist, for the use of his capital, are, in the long run, fixed by other men, and by causes quite beyond his own control. It is a widely prevalent idea that the capitalist controls the use of his own capital or, at least, the rate of the payment for its use.

But the fact is quite the reverse. If he puts his money into a bank to be loaned, he has to be content with the current rates of interest. If he invests it in a railroad corporation, or in a manufacturing or trading corporation, he has to be content, in the long run, with the average returns on similar investments. His investments may at times be extremely fortunate. At times, they will be unfortunate—unless, indeed, he is an unusually wise investor, in which case he is justly entitled to the fruits of his own

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

financial wisdom. And precisely in proportion to the wisdom of his investments will be the benefits to the community resulting from these investments. In short, he is at all times, in the end, subject to the laws of industry and commerce, and the returns on his capital are decided by those laws.

It may be thought that an exception to this statement is to be found in the case of the railroads; and that they have it in their power to fix the rates of traffic almost arbitrarily.

But the exception here is more seeming than real. Even the railroads are subject to the laws of commerce. They are, in their own way, all subject to competition; and none of them has an arbitrary control of the rates to be charged for transportation. This is the case quite independently of statutes, or control by the public authorities. Every railroad, if we carefully consider the facts, has a competitor in other railroads. Whatever may be its power over its own rates under the theory of the law, nevertheless, as a matter of fact, every railroad is compelled, in the long run, to give as favorable rates for both passengers and freight as other roads give. Otherwise, passengers and freight will go elsewhere. Attempts have been made through mergers and consolidations to escape the regulative influence of competition in reducing rates. But these attempts have always failed. The laws of commerce will assert their supremacy. Assume that railroad corporations will impose as high rates "as the traffic will bear." Nevertheless, the traffic on one road cannot long bear higher rates for the same service than are paid on other roads. If any one road insists on higher rates, it soon loses its traffic. Business men leave it; they seek other homes, for their business and themselves. They go where they get the most for their money. Then, too, after the railroads are once constructed, they soon find that the quickest and surest way to get an increase in income is to make a decrease in traffic charges. So it results that, although in theory the railroad may have the power to fix its own rates for traffic, nevertheless, in fact, it finds itself compelled, in time, to lower its charges, and reduce them to the lowest figures which will secure a reasonable return on the capital invested. More than that, the instances are numberless where millions on millions of capital have been sunk in railroad enterprises, which have never yielded a dollar of income to the investor. Meantime, not by force of any law other than the laws of industry, the quality of our railroad

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

service has had a steady and rapid increase; while, at the same time, traffic rates, for both freight and passengers, have had a steady and rapid decrease. Our railroad service, taken as a whole, is to-day superior to that of any other nation; and that fact is due, not to any statutes, or to governmental control, but to the natural legitimate operation of the laws of trade and commerce; and to our conditions of large industrial freedom.

What, then, are the evils which have resulted from these large modern accumulations of capital?

None whatever. That is, there have been no evils which can be correctly attributed to these large accumulations on the score of their mere magnitude. The only evils that have come, have come from the wrongful, illegal uses of capital in order to deprive other men of some of their legal rights. Wherever money has been used to corrupt public officials, that constitutes a violation of law. Where favoritism in rates has been shown to particular individuals or corporations, that has been a violation of law. It should be punished by enforcement of the law, at the hands of either public or private prosecutors. But, in these recent years, it has been found much more profitable for high public officials to rail at the "trusts" than to enforce the laws against the individuals who have made unlawful uses of trust funds. Violent declamation, against capital and corporations, is the ready resort of the demagogue. But an efficient enforcement of the laws, against individuals who make illegal uses of corporate moneys and corporate properties—that is a different matter. The evils, which have existed in the management of our great modern "trusts," so called, have consisted entirely in the unlawful uses that have been made of trust properties. In the trusts themselves—in the mere large accumulations of capital—there are no evils, or dangers, so long as the capital is put to lawful uses; so long as it is used for legitimate business purposes. Nor is there anything novel in our modern breaches of trust and violations of law. Such evils have existed ever since human beings held property. The forms of punishment for those breaches of trust are old and well known. What is needed, in order to put an end to such offences, is the speedy and rigid enforcement of existing laws.

The modern increase in the figures of capital invested in large enterprises has been necessary, and unavoidable. The large in-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

crease in our control over the forces of nature has resulted in a large increase in the magnitude of our modern combinations of men and material, for the uses of our modern industries. No doubt, we have in later years witnessed what may accurately be termed a mania for magnitude. We have, no doubt, gone to extremes in this direction. But, in the main, these large modern industrial combinations have been a great benefit. They undoubtedly do result in large economies; and in a large increase of industrial energy. Waste of material, which will escape notice when it exists in small quantities, at once compels attention when it reaches larger proportions. That leads to the discovery of new processes; which result in what we term "by-products." Then, too, these large combinations of men, which we have in our modern industrial armies, make it more possible to have superior organization—a better selection of men for the different orders of work. They render it possible for us to make the fullest use of our modern "captains of industry" in positions of command. Captains cannot be used without the rank and file who are to be led. If at any time these combinations of capital get too large for efficient and profitable handling, they will fall to pieces; they will resolve themselves into their original constituents. But, so long as they continue to pay, so long as they can be operated with a profit to their owners, so long it is certain that they are giving good service to the community; so long the community should secure them the full protection of the law.

It is hard to conceive of anything more injurious to the well-being of the community than the present wholesale denunciation of "trusts"—meaning thereby our large corporate aggregations of capital. Misappropriation and illegal use of corporate funds we have unfortunately had in large amounts. The remedy for such acts is to be found in pursuing the guilty individuals, according to well-established legal methods. But that course our public prosecutors seem to have carefully avoided. Somewhat singularly, the guilty individuals have usually been large contributors to the party treasuries; and those contributions have frequently constituted the most serious misuses of corporate funds. It may be, that here we have the real reason why we have such a superfluity of sensational declamation about "trusts," coupled with such an absence of prosecutions for clear violations of the law. But there can be no doubt as to the great injury to our

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

financial and industrial interests, that results from these continuous attacks on our large modern accumulations of capital. Capital must be secure and prosperous, in order to secure the interests of labor. The interests of the two are harmonious. Every capitalist is a laborer. Every laborer is a capitalist. The difference between them is only one of degree. The capitalist and the laborer should cooperate. And everything from high public officials which tends to rouse hostility to capital is a crime against the community.

Especially is this true at the present time. Just at this time, we need industrial peace. We need just now a large increase in our facilities for transportation. We need at once the expenditure of large amounts by our railroads, for track and equipment. Capital is proverbially timid. Investors will be unwilling to advance the many millions, which are now necessary, in order to bring our railroads and other public highways up to the needs of the times. We can command the capital of the world for the development of our means of transportation provided we make its owners feel secure as to investments made in our railroads. If, however, our highest public officials, who should be the protectors of capital, are constantly doing all in their power to arouse against it the prejudices of the ignorant, the injuries done to the community's business interests will be incalculable.

In the corporate abuses which have in recent years so excited the public, capital has not been the real offender. The real offenders have been the men who have misused capital which belonged to others. Capital requires every possible protection, in the hands of corporations as well as of individuals. If there be any difference between the two, more care should be given to the protection of capital in the hands of corporations, than to capital in the hands of individuals. The reason is, that its amount is so much larger, and its misuse so much easier. Especially, our railroads should receive every possible protection, and have every possible security, at the hands of the government. No doubt, they should be under wise governmental supervision. No doubt, there should be a rigid enforcement of the law as to capital's misuse. On the other hand, however, the well-being of the community requires, that capital should have the most complete security, the fullest protection, at the hands of the entire community.

ALBERT STICKNEY.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE CUBAN NEGRO.

BY LIEUTENANT-COLONEL R. L. BULLARD, U.S.A.

For hours I had been conscious of a hollow pounding upon my ears, the distant beating of a tom-tom in the still air of the Cuban evening; but a preoccupied mind had refused to turn to it. Now the air, stirring to a breeze, began to bring other sounds—voices, at first few and low, then more numerous and louder, and at last strange songs, cries and the mingled noises of busy feet and clapping hands. It was the "Congo" dance. For a moment I looked at the grotesque costumes of black men and women with faces barren of refinement, intelligence or thought, yet deep-set with fervor and intent upon this outlandish dance brought from dark Africa; then I turned to go. "Brutes almost," was the thought that rose to my mind, "brutes, not worth the stumbling that brought me to find them in the darkness." Yet I paused. "They are men, of the dignity of the image of God and they constitute a real question in Cuba to-day." White Cuba and America may not turn from them. This is no essay of jeering. If follies and weaknesses are noted most, it is for knowledge and wise action, not for ridicule.

West Africa was the source of the slave supply of all the Western Hemisphere. Whether, therefore, we consider the negro in Cuba or in the United States, we should look to find him in his prime characteristics the same in both places, and so we do. Yet in Cuba he has been subjected to special conditions that differentiate him from his brother in the United States.

In the days of Cuba's colonization, Spain was a conqueror. When master, the Spaniard has always been a hard, uncompromising one. To maintain these qualities in her colonists, Spain long permitted to come to the New World only the Castilians and others from her southern provinces whose natures, she knew,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

had been hardened and made fierce, masterful—nay, cruel almost—by long contact and struggle with the Saracens. She intended that her colonists should be of a nature to spare not, and so they were. Within one hundred years their hard mastership had utterly exterminated the native Indians of Cuba, whom they had enslaved and whom they literally worked to death. The great priest, de Las Casas, seeking to save the unhappy Indians, first, it is said, recommended the introduction of negroes as slaves; but, says history, the father soon helplessly saw that in being kind to the one he had but been cruel to the other race. Negro slaves poured into Cuba and were treated almost as beasts. Their span of life in the fields was five years. Supply, however, was inexhaustible.

With countless women at the master's will, there soon sprang up a race between the mulattoes, the Creoles, free perhaps for the master's blood in their veins. For the honor, the favor or the relief it carried from the bitter toil that had exterminated the Indians and was still sweeping away the African slave, this blood was sought, and the pure blood of their own race disdained by the female blacks and mulattoes. It spread until it filled the land, approximated white and can no more be traced. It has made impossible all clear distinction between races. We may know the extremes, but the means blend. But, free or slave, black or mulatto, the mother's side, the rearing and teaching side, the side that gives character to man, has been essentially negro, and has made the type.

Though they gained greatly in numbers, the freemen did not gain much in progress. They repeated what seems the story of the blood when left to itself; they were soon found lagging. Idleness, superstition and sensualism, the failings of the race, seized upon them. Nature has wonderfully endowed Cuba. Nutritious fruits grew in rich abundance, almost without cultivation; comfort demanded but a poor house, little clothing and less fire; it was hardly necessary to work, and, besides, the climate was hard upon the laborer. Unharried by other men's ideas, the free part of the race naturally and easily held or returned to its African beliefs and practices in religion and marriage—conjury in the one and promiscuousness in the other. Morality does not enter into original African religions. From then until to-day, the Cuban negro freemen have propagated and continue to propagate

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

largely without regard to family or marriage. To the civilized mind the horror of slavery was its annihilation of the family. With these, family is to a large extent made upon passion and broken on whim; it is little regarded.

The history of Cuba records two or three attempts at insurrection by the slaves to gain freedom. But these were disjointed, pitiful, ineffectual, quickly and easily suppressed. They brought no results. In Cuba's various efforts to throw off the yoke of Spain, Cuban negroes always joined on the promise and in the hope of freedom; but these too failed; and, though some thus attained freedom, the race remained in slavery, unable to save itself, until freedom came at last, not as a victory wrung, but as gift received, from Spain.

As to the negro's part in Cuba's final struggle for independence, no word can be said in derogation of it by his worst enemy. He bore it as the best. Indeed, it was his war. He was the soldier, the man behind the gun, the arm that swung the machete; but this too failed, and Cuba's freedom came to her, exhausted and defeated, as it had come to her negroes, as a gift from another. The race has not saved either itself or its country, and history goes sadly against that boastful feeling which is common among them to-day, that what they are, that they have made themselves.

The sun that made the race made it nocturnal. Night is the time of pleasure. It fills their Cuban villages, quarters and country with voices, music and dance. As non-intellectual, and therefore without personal resources, they are dependent upon their fellows for entertainment and company. They are gregarious in Cuba, as elsewhere. They flock together for fun. In close, airless rooms, they dance the night through, and the morrow cares for itself.

There are two dances, the "Congo" and the "Creole," both protracted perhaps through many nights. The first is a memory or tradition of Africa. In it, men and women, black, real negroes, sing the songs and dance the dances of Africa to the sound of rattles and rude drums, genuine savage instruments. The dance is always significant. It takes many forms of war, love, tradition and conjury, yet it is most addressed to the sexual passions and can but lead to their indulgence. The "Congo" may be seen to-day in any country town in the cane regions.

The "Creole" aspires to be very different. It is a modified

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

waltz by the more mixed generation, far less interesting, more modern, but not more moral than the Congo. One needs but to see it to be impressed with its sensuality.

There is the usual marked love of music and musical instruments, the guitar, the mandolin, the flute and the piano, a large proportion of the race being performers in the usual "ragtime" upon some of these instruments.

From Africa, with the love of music and dance, they have brought to Cuba, too, as to America, the folk-lore, those animal tales that delight the hearts of children and simple folk. It is for some one to save these for Cuba, as Joel Chandler Harris has done for America.

With Cubans, distinctions on account of race, color and previous condition of servitude are neither sharp nor hard. Not with them, as with English-bred men, does one drop of negro blood make the negro. They are all liberal. All professions and all opportunities are open to all the race, and some have distinguished themselves as soldiers, editors and politicians. Everywhere—in public, in the streets, in the theatres, on steamers and cars—our man of negro blood carries himself with confidence and self-possession. It is his marked characteristic in Cuba. Looking at him, one cannot but be impressed with his great gain in dignity in consequence. He feels himself a worthier man. In rural guard, police and other official positions occupied by him, he conducts himself with steadiness and dignity. Placing him in such offices seems not in Cuba, as in America, to make him foolish and giddy. These are noteworthy things for Cuba and the negro race.

After an absence of thirty years, I went back to find an old nurse living within a stone's-throw of the spot where she had been born a slave, had raised her family and lived her life. No change, no offer, no price had moved her. She was the type of her race in the South. This wonderful love of home, which binds the American negro still to the place of his fathers, seems wholly wanting in the Cuban. He is a wanderer, cares little for family and less for home. He passes easily from place to place; and, in the season of the cane-cutting, migrates in numbers from province to province, a thing unknown among American negroes.

A more striking difference between him and the American is

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

in the matter of religion. The latter is a devoted church-man, holds long meetings, is a shouter, "falls under conviction" and visits heaven and hell in trances and dreams. Not so the Cuban. It is said of all Cubans that they are religious for baptism, marriage and burial. The negro takes in only the first. For religion in general he cares little, and for that little principally in connection with conjury and the black arts. In families of Spanish breeding and tradition, religious instruction and moral instruction belong to the priest, not the family. Cuba, to be abreast of the age, disestablished the religious instruction of the Catholic Church. With the religious went the moral instruction, for no one has taken the priest's place and the Cuban to-day is largely without moral instruction. The negro went all the further in the direction of indifference, from the revulsion that came with freedom from the law's compulsory religious instruction, which, in slavery times, cut down his short hours of rest and recreation. As above all men his nature seems to call for a religion, he has made up for the loss by an excess of superstition. A large part of the race believes in witchcraft, conjury, spells, dreams, and all the trickery and absurdity of the black arts. These practices and fragments of beliefs have become inextricably mixed up with the Christian religion, producing a mass of foolishness.

The Saints, especially Sts. Barbara and Lazarus, are confounded with memories and traditions of African deities to whom they may bear some resemblance. The laws of Cuba have attempted to suppress the practice of witchcraft and conjury, but have been unable to make much way against them. They have continued in the very highest centres of civilization. The Cuban press shows constant arrests, often in Havana itself, of parties of men and women, assembled for the ceremonies of these arts.

"Obtala" is the chief being appealed to. He is of both sexes and represents the reproductive forces of nature. He is followed by a god of thunders and hot rocks (meteors) and by many others, each with his specialty. To the devotee, these gods or saints do not, it is said, represent principles of good and evil, but forces of nature, or beings who, following their own will without regard to humans, may do the latter much harm in an incidental, careless way, and are so to be provided against, persuaded or even forced, and the conjurer is the one through whom this is done. After gifts and the observance of due forms, sickness is cured, an

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

enemy is hurt, a revenge given or a sweetheart won by curious prescriptions. To cure toothache the devotee is told to spit in the mouth of a toad; to drive away enemies or disagreeable persons, sprinkle wet bread-crumbs across the threshold; to win her beloved, the maiden is told to tie seven knots in a string, each time repeating his name, then to bury the string with a rag of his clothes, etc. Such things are harmless to everybody except the devotees themselves, whom they keep benighted.

The conjurer is paid for his devices and prescriptions, but he rarely becomes a serious abuse for his impositions in this respect, though he may become much feared. To him it is also given to tell fortunes and interpret dreams. From these he reaps an easy harvest and gains enormously in prestige.

Together conjury and augury exercise a wonderful influence over the minds of their devotees. These not infrequently work themselves into such states of exaltation and fervor that they fall into long trances.

In the mind of the African the right to eat is unconditioned. It does not depend upon work. This makes him a thief, but not a bad one. He steals for his stomach's sake, perhaps a little for his fancy. He is a small thief, never a highwayman. Such is he in Cuba.

He is the largest inhabitant of the jail; but let it be said to his credit that he does not commit against the other race that unbearable crime of which lynching is the common result in the United States. This is a blessed difference. If it depends upon his difference of status and treatment in Cuba, then we have something to learn here.

Tenderness in point of color is of the race and limited to no locality. Everywhere they long to throw it off. The earliest negroes brought to Cuba a sad, faint little belief that after death they should be born again into another land, white men. "Negro" and even "mulatto" must be softened to "*gente de color*" (colored people) and "*pardo*" (brown), while the housemaid becomes "*Señorita*" (miss) and the cook "*Señora*" (lady). These, and the tendency, in the face of manifest aversion, to push themselves as equals upon another race, are discouraging signs of weakness, showing a lack of that genuine independence, self-respect and pride that indicate strength and real worth.

With a quicker temper he is less of a fighter than his Amer-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ican brother, is less devoted to the revolver and black-handled razor. He puts his trust in the more visible, and therefore less dangerous, machete. He is more of a gambler; is more polite, with less regard for the truth—which he can violate with a straight face, carelessly and without expectation of ever being pinned down. His grave defect is lack of serious purpose. Indefinitely he is ambitious for himself and children; but for this very lack of serious purpose he can hardly bring himself to pay the price of success.

We hear negroes everywhere spoken of as "lazy," yet they produce, we know, a large part of the cotton and sugar of the world. No race can show less for what it does, the difficulty again being a lack of continuing purpose. In Cuba, politically and socially, they desire recognition, but they seek it rather by agitation than by merit or worth. They are certainly unrestricted. All trades, all careers, all professions are open to them, but the same lack of practical purpose causes them to be found usually in the lower occupations. Though found in more professions than in America, they are less industrious there than here. They show disposition but no aptness for commerce, and their inclination in this direction must perhaps be looked upon more as a desire to avoid the hard labor of the fields than as any serious effort to try fortune in trade.

The sentimental for the negro is everywhere above the substantial. The old sergeant whom I encountered in Cuba had piecemeal answered me that he was surer of all substantial rights, surer of justice, better protected by the laws, lived better and earned more in the United States, but he ended with saying: "Ten to one, sir, I'd rather live in Cuba, because here there's no difference between us and white folks." He spoke the desire of his whole race. This distinction is their heaviest burden. Said a young man who had followed the American forces to Cuba in the war with Spain: "I'd rather live in Cuba, Colonel, 'cause de cullud peoples here lives married to white folks jes de same es anybody. En dey eats wid um en drinks wid um en talks to um jes de same as anybody. An den anodder thing, dey's policemans jes de same es white uns." The ablest of his blood in their longest dissertations have not yet stated as plainly and as fully the whole aspiration of the race as this simple fellow in three brief sentences.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The boast of Cuba has been equality of the races. There are signs in its higher classes of a feeling that they are coming to the limit of this as a living rule. On the other hand, there are indications in the negro race of an intention to demand greater consideration. This points, perhaps, to sharper divisions.

We are accustomed to regard the negro as more impulsive, emotional and excitable than the white man. Looking at the black and white Cuban together, however, one cannot fail to be impressed with a remarkable reversal of the usual here. The negro is the more self-contained, placid, reserved—aye, and dignified. Yet, he has been the man who has filled the ranks of the revolutions. Constituting about thirty per cent. of the population, he yet made up some fifty per cent. of the insurgents in 1898 and eighty in 1906. His ignorance and lack of anchor in world's goods and family restraints leave him free for anything. His color feeling makes him the easy victim of any tale of racial wrong, inequality or injustice, be it never so flimsy. From almost a century of it, he, with all Cuba, has come almost to regard non-submission to government, insurrection and revolution as demonstrating in the man the highest qualities of manhood, independence and love of liberty. Withal he is too apt to go off after the first scoundrel, guerrilla or disappointed politician.

Notwithstanding the whisperings of knowledge and reason, Cubans as yet credit Cuba's independence of Spain to Cuban deeds. There are few who are ready to admit, what the world knows, that Cubans had failed when the "Maine" was blown up. Among the great common bulk there is quiet assumption that they, none others, drove out the Spaniards. So think the black population, who so largely formed the ranks of the revolution. Having taken, as they think, so effective a part in securing the independence of their country, they are inclined to demand a corresponding part in its administration.

R. L. BULLARD.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

JAPAN AND THE UNITED STATES—PARTNERS.

BY BARON KENTARO KANEKO, LL.D., PRIVY COUNCILLOR, FORMERLY MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE AND COMMERCE.

THE geographical relation of Japan and the United States is such that they can never come into collision with each other. All the nations of Europe, and America, are looking for new markets for their industries, and the only market now remaining which can be exploited with benefit is the continent of Asia. And with Asia as the goal of international trade, what nations stand in the most advantageous position to garner the fruit of her commerce? Clearly, they are the United States and Japan.

Now let us examine the coast line of the United States. Beginning at Alaska with its littoral fronting British Columbia, down through Oregon and Southern California, then through the Hawaiian Islands, Guam and the Philippines, the United States occupies almost two-thirds of the whole coast of the Pacific Ocean; while the remaining one-third is held by Japan, beginning with Formosa, adjoining the Philippines, and including Loochoo, the Kurile Islands and the newly acquired territory of Saghalin. With the exception of Kamchatka, which is Russian, the whole Pacific Ocean is the common waterway of the international trade of the United States and Japan. Therefore, these two nations, if they undertake to exploit Asiatic trade, need have no fear of any rival stepping in. Japan stands nearest to the Asiatic market, and next comes the United States.

All the nations of Europe must send their goods to Asia either by way of the Cape of Good Hope or through the Suez Canal and across the Indian Ocean, a long and expensive route. The natural advantages favor Japan and the United States beyond measure. Hence, we find the tonnage of American and

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Japanese shipping on the Pacific increasing year by year, as a glance at the statistics will show, and the volume of American and Japanese trade with Asiatic countries growing enormously. These facts are matters of record and easily ascertained.

Moreover, a prominent factor in the international relation is the submarine cable which connects San Francisco, Honolulu, Guam, the Philippines and the continent of Asia. This is an American line. By this line the Japanese can send commercial telegrams to Asia with the greatest speed and at the cheapest rate. Thus the shipping interest and the submarine cable connect the United States, Japan and Asia so intimately that any misunderstanding or friction or irritation between the United States and Japan is bound to affect instantly the trade of the three.

Now, as we all know, the first object of diplomacy to-day is to extend our commercial influence among other nations and increase our international commerce. If diplomats will but bear this principle in mind, how can they permit such important relations of these great peoples to be disturbed by the mere whim of politicians or of ambitious statesmen who would play a high-handed policy in international questions? Any rash action on the part of the Government would react very heavily and instantly upon the purse of the people. And here we have the most powerful influence to keep the ambition of politicians and statesmen at bay.

In the twentieth century the sole object of diplomacy is to keep near neighbors in cordial relationship so that they may benefit themselves and each other in the exchange of merchandise to mutual advantage.

So much for theory. Now I shall state the actual relations of the United States and Japan in commerce. What Japan supplies to the United States can never be produced in that country, namely, raw silk, tea and artistic goods. Although efforts have been made many times to raise the mulberry and cocoon and tea in the southern parts of the United States, these could not be grown with profit, and, as I am informed, the Americans have abandoned the idea. The three articles I mention are peculiarly the products of the Japanese people. Government statistics show that, in the year ending December 31st, 1906, the raw silk exported from Japan amounted to 120,000,000 yen (equal to

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

$60,000,000), out of which ninety per cent. went to the United States. The amount of tea we exported last year was 40,000,000 yen ($20,000,000), which was sent largely to the United States and Canada.

So I can fairly state that no lady in the United States can get a silk dress if we stop the export of silk to that country, and that the average American citizen cannot drink tea if our tea is excluded from America. So much for the dependence of the American people on Japanese products.

But if any American will study closely the condition of Japanese life, he will simply be amazed to find how much we depend upon American products. In the ordinary upper or middle class families in Japan, we get up in the morning from a bed whose sheets are made of American cotton, put on the Japanese costume, which is made from American cotton, eat bread whose flour comes from Minnesota, and take a cup of tea with condensed milk from Chicago and sugar from the Philippines, Hawaii or the southern United States. After breakfast, we light a cigarette or take a puff at a pipe. In either the tobacco used comes from Virginia, Tennessee or some other American State. We take up our morning newspapers whose pages are of paper imported from Milwaukee or western Connecticut. So great is the extent of Japanese dependence upon the United States. We cannot raise raw cotton. Of the raw cotton imported into Japan, seventy-five per cent. comes from the United States. Condensed milk, tobacco leaf, flour and paper we cannot either raise or make in our country at prices lower than the Americans charge.

At night, all our streets, in every city, town and hamlet, from the extreme north of Kurile to the extreme south of Formosa, are lit with petroleum which comes from West Virginia or Pennsylvania. So, then, the United States feeds us, clothes us and gives us light. The Japanese cannot live a single hour without American supplies.

Now, let us look at the industrial plants. Baldwin locomotives, telephones, electric apparatus, street-cars and practically all the machines in small shops are imported from the United States. These imports are increasing year by year, while at the same time our exports to the United States are increasing with equal rapidity. Since the United States Government has taken up its policy of expansion toward the west the trade of the two

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

nations, far from conflicting, is growing without any collision or disadvantage to either party. Politicians and business men are aware, through their daily reports and commercial information, of the facts I have cited. Therefore it is that the people of Japan feel that under these circumstances the two nations are destined to play an important rôle in extending their trade into the continent of Asia, and that it is their natural function to open up China to international trade.

Since the commerce of the two nations is so closely interwoven and increasing to the benefit of both, no ambitious politician can sever such a relation by his political schemes, because the people will not stand it, will prevent any action that tends to put an end to a mutual benefit. At the moment this is written, with the school question unsettled, the American-Japanese situation might be likened to that between the United States and England more than half a century ago when the commercial relation of the two countries prevented the possibility of their making war upon each other. I heard an anecdote when I was in London a few years ago which makes the point very clear. At the time of a certain burning question between Great Britain and the United States, Lord Granville, the Minister of Foreign Affairs, and Mr. Motley, the American Minister, sat together in the office of the former. The air was full of rumors of war.

"Mr. Motley," said Lord Granville, "there is no use of our discussing this matter diplomatically. I ask you for a simple answer to one question: 'Shall it be war or peace?'"

There practically was an ultimatum delivered to Mr. Motley. He sat at ease for a few moments; then replied: "If your Lordship thinks that war is the only form of settlement of this question, I have only one suggestion to make."

"And that is?"

"That you burn Liverpool by your order and our Government will burn the city of New York."

This reply at once brought a smile to the face of Lord Granville.

"Mr. Motley," he said, "I see your point. We will not talk any further of war."

For at that moment Liverpool warehouses were full of American raw material, whereas in New York there was a great stock of British manufactured goods. Such intimate relations of in-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ternational commerce formed the best guarantee of peace. The burning question was arranged in a friendly way.

Let us see how that condition of facts applies to the present situation. Japan sends raw material to the United States and the United States sends manufactured goods to Japan. If we sever our relations and fight each other, the commercial ties between the two nations would be shattered, and the Chinese market would fall into the hands of England, Germany and France. Thus the United States and Japan, no matter how favored by their geographical advantages on the Pacific Ocean and by their means of quick communication by the submarine cable, would lose all the benefit of the Asiatic trade. I need not stop to point out how very necessary that market is to both countries. Would that be a wise diplomatic policy which should sever our united nations? Can the people stand a policy so detrimental to international comity? I repeat that in the twentieth century it is the increase and expansion of international commerce that guides the policy of the nations.

Besides the material arguments for peace, we must remember that America and Japan have been friends ever since the advent of Commodore Perry. There has never arisen between them one troublesome question, their diplomatic relations have always remained cordial, and the trade of the two nations has increased within the last thirty years with unparalleled rapidity.

And I might prophesy that commerce between the two countries will be trebled when the Panama Canal is completed. Cotton and tobacco will come from Galveston and New Orleans through the Canal direct to Yokohama, instead of going across the Atlantic to Gibraltar and around by way of the Indian Ocean. American petroleum, heavy machinery and flour, which now have to cross the Atlantic to reach us, will come through the Canal. In one word, the Isthmian Canal will bring the American Atlantic coast and the Gulf of Mexico much nearer to Yokohama than they are to-day.

So we see clearly that Japan and the United States, friends of half a century, still have vital need of each other, to say nothing of the prospect of great mutual benefit through united effort in Asia. And the suggestion that the American or Japanese people would tolerate any hostile policy by their statesmen cannot be for one moment believed.

KENTARO KANEKO.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

NEW BOOKS REVIEWED.

BY CHARLES KLEIN, CHARLES JOHNSTON AND OLIVIA HOWARD DUNBAR.

"MARK TWAIN AND CHRISTIAN SCIENCE."*

I.

It is impossible to read Mark Twain's book on "Christian Science" without coming to the conclusion that not only Christian Science but every other religious belief appeals to his sense of humor—and to his sense of humor only, and this gives rise to the question (in my mind at least) as to whether the comic point of view is a valuable or even a reliable point of view in the consideration of religious topics.

The first part of Mr. Twain's book is devoted to the *Reductio ad absurdum* method of dealing with the subject—a prolific field for the humorist to work in, but scarcely a profitable one for the seeker after Truth, or even the investigator who is anxious to know something about the matter. Indeed if it were not for the unjust and unfounded statements against Mrs. Eddy, seriously made by Mr. Twain, in the latter part of his work, it would be impossible to take the book seriously. For example, does Mr. Twain really wish his readers to infer that the Christian Science prayer contains such expressions as "Ante and pass the buck," "All down but nine," "Set 'em up in another alley," or is his object merely to infuse poker and bowling-alley atmosphere into a religious subject? It would have been far easier for Mr. Twain's readers if he had given them a key to his book explaining what he wished them to take seriously and what he wished them merely to laugh at; it would have been far easier for them if he had explained what he intended them to regard as truth and what he intended

* "Christian Science." By Mark Twain. New York and London: Harper & Brothers.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

them to regard as pure fiction. As the book stands it is a combination of truth and fiction which is most misleading, for one doesn't know which Mr. Twain intends to be which; it is a mixture of not too skilfully blended sense and nonsense, and while it is not funny enough to appeal to one's sense of humor it fails equally to convince in its serious moments. As the matter stands, so carefully has Mr. Twain hidden his meaning that, after reading the book, I honestly don't know whether he regards Christian Science as the greatest blessing or the greatest evil the world has ever known.

It is Mr. Twain himself who has set a value on his work; he says (page 43): "Upon a great religious or political question the opinion of the dullest head in the world is worth the same as the opinion of the brightest head—a brass farthing." Then why? But that's not the question—Mr. Twain's opinion is here. Is it worth even the price at which he quotes it? I think not, for from beginning to end Mr. Twain misunderstands where he does not misstate the beliefs of Christian Scientists. For instance, when a Christian Scientist says there are no such things as pain and sickness, the Scientist means that pain and sickness are beliefs, that they are relative and not permanent realities, and that they can be destroyed, he (the Christian Scientist) does not deny their relative, but their absolute, existence. There is a difference between relative and absolute Truth (Mr. Twain doubtless knows this) as in its philosophic sense, Eternity destroys the idea of Time. So does the Idea of Good destroy the Idea of Evil.

Mr. Twain says (page 38) that he is being sued for payment for Christian Science treatment. Is this misstatement deliberate or accidental? A Christian Scientist would not use legal means to obtain payment for his services, and the person who did could not continue to be a Christian Scientist, in fact, would automatically cease to be one. But perhaps this is Mr. Twain's humorous way of suggesting a possibility.

But what are we to believe in the face of the following? "For of all the strange and frantic and incomprehensible and uninterpretable books," says Mr. Twain (page 29) "which the imagination of man has created, surely this one" ("Science and Health," Mrs. Eddy's book) "is the prize sample."

Now this is perfectly clear: Mr. Twain declares that "Science and Health" is "incomprehensible and uninterpretable"—so far

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

his attitude is plain. What then are we to understand by this?

"Let the reader turn," says Mr. Twain (page 267), "to the excerpt I have made from the chapter on Prayer (last year's edition of 'Science and Health') and compare that *wise* and *sane* and *elevated* and *lucid* piece of work with the aforesaid Preface," etc., etc.

Now may I ask Mr. Twain just what he means by calling Mrs. Eddy's work, "Science and Health," "strange and frantic and incomprehensible and uninterpretable" on page 29, and on page 267, when criticising parts of the same work, he calls it "wise and sane and elevated and lucid"?

Can anything be more "strange, frantic, incomprehensible and uninterpretable" than this? Again:

"I feel sure," says Mr. Twain (page 30), "that none but the membership (meaning Christian Scientists) can understand it ('Science and Health'). It is only the martial tooting of the trombone and merely stirs the soul through the noise, but does not convey a meaning."

Indeed! What then does Mr. Twain mean by the following:

"If she (Mrs. Eddy) borrowed the Great Idea (in 'Science and Health') did she carry it away in her head or in manuscript? Did she hit on the Great Idea herself? By the Great Idea I mean, of course, the conviction that the healing force involved was still existent and could be applied now, just as it was applied by Christ's Disciples." Further (page 283), "And I think that *the Great Idea,*" (the italics are mine) "*Great* as it was would have enjoyed but a brief activity and would have then gone to sleep for some more centuries but for the perpetuating impulse it got from that organized and tremendous force" (the Christian Science movement).

Now in the name of common sense, how can Mr. Twain make such obviously contradictory statements and expect the public to take them seriously? "No one can understand it." "It is only the martial tooting of a trombone." It "does not convey a meaning." What about the Great Idea, Mr. Twain? "The Great Idea" that received "the perpetuating impulse it got from that organized and tremendous force"? So it has a meaning and a very great one it seems: great enough to be worth stealing, for later on in his book he accuses Mrs. Eddy of stealing it!

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

He then goes on to say (page 292) that "she has restored to the world neglected and abandoned features of the Christian religion (physical healing) which her thousands of followers find gracious, and blessed, and contenting." "But," he says on page 268 "there is a mightier benefaction than the healing of the body, and that is the healing of the spirit, which is Christian Science's other claim. So far as I know," continues Mr. Twain, "so far as I can find out, it makes it good. Personally I have not known a Scientist who did not seem serene, contented, unharassed."

And all this, mark you, through the study of the works of one who is "untruthful"—is this reasonable? But let Mr. Twain continue: "If time shall prove that the Science can heal the persecuted spirit of man,"—and Mr. Twain has stated on page 268 that so far as he can find out *it has been proven*—"why then Mrs. Eddy will have a monument that will reach above the clouds." Christian Scientists believe that "she has delivered to them a religion which has revolutionized their lives, banished the glooms that shadowed them, and filled them and flooded them with sunshine and gladness and peace." But they are "prejudiced" witnesses!

"Is it insanity," asks Mr. Twain (page 49), "to believe that Christian Scientism is destined to make the most formidable show that any new religion has made in the world since the birth and spread of Mohammedanism?" "It has a better chance to grow and prosper and achieve permanency than any other existing *ism,* for it has more to offer than any other." "And who are attracted by Christian Science? There is no limit. It appeals to the rich, the poor, the high, the low, the *cultured,* the ignorant, the *gifted,* the stupid, the modest, the *wise,* the silly, etc.," (the italics are mine) "they who are ailing in body and mind, they who have friends who are ailing in body and mind. To mass it in a phrase, its clientage is the Human Race. Will it march? I think so. Remember its principal great offer—to rid the race of pain and disease. Can it do so? In large measure, Yes—."

All these benefits, all these blessings, all this spiritual uplifting, this freedom from sorrow and suffering, Mr. Twain allows will come from Christian Science, the acknowledged founder and discoverer of which he accuses of dishonesty. Mr. Twain, do you really believe it yourself?

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

In his concluding chapter Mr. Twain expresses himself as believing that in Christian Science there is a "field for great and distinguished usefulness," that among other things it should make voters honest, that it should try and make Congress honest, in other words, that it should make the world honest,—a splendid idea of Mr. Twain's. And yet with almost incredible inconsistency he accuses Mrs. Mary Baker G. Eddy, the founder and discoverer of Christian Science, the author of its Text-Book "Science and Health, with key to the Scriptures"—the science that he suggests should make the world honest—of wilful and deliberate dishonesty herself! The evil tree can produce good fruits, a dishonest cause can produce an honest effect—is this common logic?

Mr. Twain says that Mrs. Eddy is illiterate, shallow, incapable of reasoning, yet he declares (page 49) that Christian Science attracts among others "cultured, gifted and wise people," and that eventually Christian Science will dominate the world. Whence this power if its founder and discoverer is dishonest, illiterate, shallow and incapable of reasoning? Does Mr. Twain believe that evil has more power than good? Will he accuse the Christian Science leader of being a force for evil, while he admits that Christian Science itself is a force for good? Isn't character, force, and does Mr. Twain think that Christian Scientists are mistaken in Mrs. Eddy's character? I suspect that he has listened largely to Mrs. Eddy's enemies; but there are hundreds of thousands—and if Mr. Twain's prophecy is to come true (and I believe it will) there will soon be millions of Christian Scientists who will testify that Mrs. Eddy is exactly what he himself says she is to her followers (page 285)—"Patient, gentle, loving, compassionate, noble-hearted, and unselfish." Does Mr. Twain believe that Christian Scientists are so thoroughly in the dark as to Mrs. Eddy's real character? Does he believe that daily contact with her students and an intimate acquaintance with her life's purposes, objects, pursuits and works, an understanding of her motives, could fail to have enlightened them as to her true character when he himself says: "She has revealed it in her autobiography and the by-laws of the church"? He can read it all so plainly in her books. It is a comfortable position Mr. Twain has assumed; he can read between the lines that which many, many thousands of Christian Scientists are unable to decipher;

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

and yet among these thousands are included judges, lawyers, clergymen, doctors, university professors, authors, United States Senators, congressmen — every profession, trade and religious denomination in the world being represented. I confess I gasp in admiration at Mr. Twain's intuition—I must read that autobiography and those by-laws again.

Some years ago these attacks on Christian Science were confined to the Science alone. Now that it is generally conceded that Christian Science has established its claims, the point of attack is Mrs. Eddy herself. "Science and Health" is such a wonderful book, say its critics, that Mrs. Eddy couldn't have written it. Mr. Quimby or Mr. Somebody else must have written it—perhaps the proof-readers wrote it—anybody but Mrs. Eddy. Still the fact remains that it is written and is doing marvellous work. It is not my purpose in this paper to prove that Mrs. Eddy wrote "Science and Health"—the proof is overwhelming to those who really want the truth—but to point out that since the beginning of time this queer old world has always been ungrateful (if not maliciously cruel) to those who have done it the most good, and I should like to ask Mr. Twain and a few others on the board of strategy who are planning this concerted attack on Mrs. Eddy if it is because her work is lifting sinning and suffering humanity to a higher plane of existence that they (the aforesaid bureau) are trying to put her in the public pillory?

CHARLES KLEIN.

II

THE pleasantest thing in the book is the picture of dear old Mark at the beginning. Next come certain paragraphs. One is about a child who fell from a pony, and "demonstrated" over a swollen eye, which presently began to open. Mark Twain comments: "Why, dear, it would have opened an oyster. I think it is one of the touchingest things in child-history, that pious little rat down cellar pumping away at the Scientific Statement of Being." One of the chapters in Mrs. Eddy's "Autobiography" is headed: "Marriage and Parentage." On this Mark Twain writes: "You imagine that she is going to begin a talk about her marriage and finish with some account of her father and mother. And so you will be deceived. 'Marriage' was right, but 'Parentage' was not the best word for the rest of the record. It refers to the birth of her own child. After a certain period of

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

time 'my babe was born.' Marriage and Motherhood—Marriage and Maternity—Marriage and Product—Marriage and Dividend—either of these would have fitted the facts and made the matter clear." Again, on the sentence: "His spiritual noumenon and phenomenon silenced portraiture," he writes: "I realize that noumenon is a daisy; and I will not deny that I shall use it whenever I am in a company which I think I can embarrass with it; but, at the same time, I think it is out of place among friends in an autobiography. . . . You cannot silence portraiture with a noumenon; if portraiture should make a noise, a way could be found to silence it, but even then it could not be done with a noumenon. Not even with a brick, some authorities think." Then there is a note on Mrs. Eddy's eloquence: "She usually throws off an easy remark all sodden with Greek or Hebrew or Latin learning; she usually has a person watching for a star—she can seldom get away from that poetic idea—sometimes it is a Chaldee, sometimes a Walking Delegate, sometimes an entire stranger. . . ." But I think the finest is this: "Thus it is plain that she did not plead that the Deity was the (verbal) Author; for if she had done that, she would have lost her cause—and with rude promptness. It was in the old days before the Berne Convention and before the passage of our amended law of 1891, and the court would have quoted the following stern clause from the existing statute and frowned her out of the place: 'No Foreigner can acquire copyright in the United States.'"

But Mark Twain will never forgive me, if I do not make it clear that his book is much more than a garland of humor. In reality it is much more. It is a sober, dispassionate and very earnest study of a remarkable system, the achievement of a very gifted woman. Mark Twain shows us two sides of Mrs. Eddy's character, the brighter and the darker. He gives us a view of her enthusiastic self-reliance, her psychic gifts, her wonderful personal magnetism, her fine power of organization, her keenness and alert, practical sense. He also shows us the cloud of which this is the lining: the boundless vanity, the despotism, the cold calculating mind, the sordid pursuit of money, after a certain point in her life, and the thirst for fame and admiration at a later time. As the better side of Mrs. Eddy has had ample justice, and something more than justice done to it, by her disciples, and notably by herself, it is natural and right that

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Mark Twain should lay far more stress on the sordid despotism, the vanity, the pretence, which he makes exceedingly plain in his earnest and disinterested study. He is absolutely right in underlining the passion for money, backed up by claims of immediate divine guidance, as when Mrs. Eddy declares, in her Autobiography, that the Deity impressed her to charge $300 for a course of twelve, and later seven, lessons in healing. He is right when he points out the exorbitant prices demanded for Mrs. Eddy's books, in their hundreds of editions. And above all, he is right when he shows, with remorseless consistency, that the cult, of which Mrs. Eddy is the head, is a mental despotism, which deprives its devotees of the right and power of individual judgment, and to a large extent of individual responsibility and initiative, in all that concerns the cult and its organization. Mental despotism, anything which weakens or destroys individual discrimination, personal responsibility, is an evil, in whatever form, or under whatever pretext it appears in human life. And we cannot too often be warned against this great danger.

The impression one gets of Mrs. Eddy, by studying both sides of the question, is this. She is evidently a rarely gifted nature, a very unusual union of two qualities. On the one hand, she is a psychic, with all that this implies. She has visions of a world finer than the material earth; and, so far as they go, her visions are real. She does penetrate into regions sealed to the bodily eyes. She does perceive realms of finer forces, skies with wider horizons. And she has in a marked degree another characteristic of nearly all psychics. She tries to give expression to her thought in terms of her visions, in imagery, in parables, in metaphors. As her vision, though wide, perhaps, is not very lofty, she does not often find the real principle which links image to image; and so she strings them together in a haphazard way, mixing metaphors, confusing terms, multiplying symbols, in wildest confusion. Of these mixed metaphors Mark Twain has made a fine collection. They show that her culture is defective, if you will; but they show a great deal more. They bear all the hall-marks of the psychic temperament, and give us an insight into the world of tumbling images into which her consciousness has found its way. There is a second characteristic of the psychic temperament, and one that is a constant and formidable danger. It is vanity, the desire to put one's self forward, boastfulness, the craving for

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

notoriety and domination. If the psychic has the strength to rise above the psychic plane, and enter the real spiritual world, this evil tendency may be conquered and kept under foot. If not, then the expansion of psychic consciousness inflames vanity and egotism, and gives them an inordinate growth, such as we have seen a thousand times in the history of the world's thought.

Add to the psychic temperament, with its genuine gifts and its genuine dangers, a keen Yankee faculty for organization, and we have the outline of Mrs. Eddy's character, the seed of the plant whose overgrowths Mark Twain has pictured for us in his book. I do not at all share his apprehension that we are threatened with a future Christian Science Papacy. The heart of mankind is too sane for that. We may, indeed, grow enthusiastic over half-truths, but we shall never rest permanently content with half-truths. There will come the breaking of the shell, the new birth into a sounder and wider world.

For I think the essence of the matter is, that Christian Science is a half-truth. It is the truth, but it is not the whole truth. All mankind has, throughout the long ages, cherished the intuition of the Great Awakening into the finer life, which shall answer to our hopes and aspirations. All literature, the records of all Seers and Sages, are full of that vision and that hope. We find it in the most ancient Upanishads: "When all desires that were hid in the heart are let go, the mortal becomes immortal, and enters the Eternal. And like as the slough of a snake lies lifeless, cast forth upon an ant-hill, so lies his body, when the Spirit of man rises up bodiless and immortal, as the Life, as the Radiance, as the Eternal." We find it in Shelley's "Adonais":

> "He hath awakened from the dream of life. . . ."

And we find it in every true scripture, every true poem, between.

But we find also, in all scriptures, the indispensable condition of entrance: "He that hateth not his life shall lose it. He that hateth his life, shall keep it unto life eternal." Or, as Carlyle magnificently says: "*Es leuchtel mir ein!* The self in thee needs to be annihilated!"

There is a mirage in the psychic world, an inverted image of the divine spiritual realm above it. And this image can be reached without the great sacrifice. It promises, not self-sacrifice, but self-satisfaction, not humility, but vanity, not renunciation, but

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

"health, happiness, success in all legitimate enterprises." And for a time it keeps these promises, just as Dutch courage lasts a certain time, and enables one to face bodily dangers. But the psychic world is also an intoxicant, a stimulant, and like all stimulants, radically unwholesome.

And mankind is at heart wholesome and sane, not to be satisfied with stimulants, not to be fed with half-truths. He will throw away this husk, and demand the true bread of life. Demanding, he will be confronted with the immemorial condition: "The self in thee needs to be annihilated!" And if he fulfils the condition, then he may enter, and with joy realize what a burden selfishness has been, blinding him to the world of his immortality.

I do not, therefore, apprehend terrible things from this new psychic evangel. It is but the effervescence of a genuine power, the flush of false dawn, to be followed by real light.

CHARLES JOHNSTON.

"THE FAR HORIZON."*

IT is more than a little puzzling that a writer of Lucas Malet's experience and skill should have produced a novel bearing so many dreary resemblances to a "first book." It is as if Mrs. Harrison had absent-mindedly believed herself to be under the necessity of writing without realizing that she had nothing to write about; and had therefore languidly gathered up a handful of stock characters, loosely related them, and depended upon the expression of an acute religious bias to give life to the result. Her Spanish-Irish hero is like the ignorantly sentimental conception of a young girl; and it is astonishing that the author of "Sir Richard Calmady," which is vigorously imagined, whatever its faults of taste, should have chosen for the ostensible theme of her book so banal an idea as that expressed in the title. Dominic Iglesias is very far from unique in his contemplation of a "far horizon"; that is understood to be the novel-hero's exalted function.

Mrs. Harrison has followed the traditional method of elaborately accounting for her hero before presenting him, and her highly colored explanation makes the part that she later gives Iglesias to play seem peculiarly uninspiriting. It might also be

* "The Far Horizon." By Lucas Malet. New York: Dodd, Mead & Co.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

offered as a hint to habitual novel-readers that it is, after all, heroes of colorless, close-to-the-soil origin who afford the liveliest satisfaction in the end. Iglesias's father, a Spaniard of "far from ignoble nature," was nevertheless an anarchist, and therefore, by the very nature of his exacting profession, only intermittently domestic. The anarchist's wife, even though she was considerately spared an active share in the movement of demolition, nevertheless so suffered from contact with it that she became permanently insane. It is inartistically plain that Mrs. Harrison considers anarchy as reprehensible as Protestantism, nor is she able to restrain herself from springing out before the decent curtain of authorship to denounce both. How much better use might have been made, even of the slender material that her pages contain, one need only recall "The Princess Casamassima" to realize. There is something snugly schoolboyish in the explicit statement that the elder Iglesias was "a victim of that false passion of humanity which takes its rise, not in honest desire for the welfare of mankind, but in blind rebellion against all forms of authority. His self-confidence was colossal; all rule being abominable to him—save his own—all rulers hideous, save himself. The anarchist, rightly understood, is merely the autocrat, the tyrant, turned inside out."

From his sensational ancestry Dominic Iglesias appears to have inherited nothing of importance except that dark, melancholy beauty that has almost disappeared from fiction and that we reencounter with cheerful hopes that remain unfulfilled. The excitements of his early life seem rather to have stunned than stimulated him, so that he was able, without revolt, to remain a bank clerk for thirty-five years; an employment whence he emerges, with a pension and great personal dignity, in the first chapter. Becoming suddenly at leisure, at this sober period of life, Iglesias immediately meets, or is assailed by, the insufferably trashy heroine, whose name suggests an unfortunate contrast with Miss Sinclair's admirably described Poppy Grace in "The Divine Fire." The objection to the present Poppy is not at all that she is a vulgar person, but that she is conceived in something not far removed from a vulgar spirit. One does not receive the impression that the novelist has mysteriously "gotten inside" a showy, slangy actress; rather, that the whole picture is a rash conjecture, not a divination, and that it is, on the whole, a tiresome

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

one. Like the heroine of "Sir Richard Calmady," Poppy relies largely for her effect upon her clothes, described with exotic adjectives and great sophistication of detail. The paragraph devoted to her first appearance gives the note of the artificiality and empty pretentiousness of much of the book:

> "About her shoulders she wore a long blue-purple silk scarf, embroidered with dragons of peacock, and scarlet, and gold. These rather violent colors found repetition in the nasturtium leaves and flowers that crowned her lace hat, the wide brim of which was tied down with narrow strings of purple velvet, gypsy fashion, beneath her chin. Under her arm she carried another tiny spaniel, the creature's black morsel of a head peeping out quaintly from among the forms of the embroidered dragons, which last appeared to writhe, as in the heat of deadly conflict, as their wearer moved. Her face was in shadow owing to the breadth of the brim of her hat. Otherwise the sunshine embraced her whole figure, conferring on it a glittering yet singularly insubstantial effect, as though a column of pale wind-swept dust were overlaid, here and there, with splendor of rich enamel!"

At the close of her preposterous interview with Dominic, "Poppy St. John walked slowly along the footpath, her figure dyed by the effulgence of the skies to the crimson and gold of her name," —a sentence which the most admirable of its author's previous achievements can scarcely extenuate.

The relation that developed between these two, although it is apparently the book's only excuse for being, makes a narrative that is no more significant than it is enthralling. The unworldly Dominic's dignified stupor, which, although not unnatural when one considers the circumstances of his life, is not a magnetic quality in a hero, makes it possible for him to find Poppy St. John a delightful friend without suspecting the more irregular details of her life, or without becoming entirely aware of his own attraction for her, a fact which she violently and stagily conceals from him. He remains calm through her flattering confidence that "It's you, just simply you, that sends me back to an honest life and my profession," and disregarding the personal note that she has struck, he has the courage to address to her, a few minutes later, such a fatiguing bit of verbosity as this: "Opportunity may have been narrow, and one may have been balked of high endeavor and rich experience, by lack of talent and adverse circumstance; but in the supreme, the crowning experience, that of death and all which, for joy or sorrow, lies beyond it, even the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

most obscure, the most uncultured and untravelled must participate." By adhering to her intention to "play fair," Poppy proves an entirely safe acquaintance; and it is she who comes to weep when Iglesias lies "beautiful in death as in life, serene, proud, austere, but young now with the eternal youth of those who have believed, and attained, and reached the Land of the Far Horizon."

For this melancholy story lavish "comic relief" is provided, but in over-familiar form. A novelist must be in an inert and uninventive mood to offer once again the eternal widowed landlady, eager to ensnare her eligible lodgers, or the elderly spinster, profuse with inanities, sentimentally gauche. We are not even spared a comic parrot. De Courcy Smyth, the pauper playwright and professional borrower, is an equally old story and the pompous clergyman is a bubble whose pricking is become a five-finger exercise for even the amateur analyst. Sir Abel Barking, the smug bank president, "pursy, prolific, Protestant," is too usual and on the whole too inoffensive to warrant the virulence with which he is anathematized. Such people as these cannot interest, not only because they are too obvious types, but because they are types that have become familiar in books rather than in life. With the exception of certain pictures of London, there is perhaps not a single direct impression from life in the novel. And although it will be easy to recall cases where clergymen and landladies and sentimental spinsters have been found engaging, it will be because they have been conceived with tenderness or with humor. It is a hard and superficial observation that produces such results as this,—an observation guided neither by an energetic imagination nor by a judiciously selective taste.

OLIVIA HOWARD DUNBAR.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

WORLD-POLITICS.

LONDON: ST. PETERSBURG.

LONDON, *February, 1907.*

IN issuing, on February 5th, the usual letter to his followers, summoning them to attend the opening of Parliament, the Prime Minister made use of a significant phrase. He announced that "the attention of the House of Commons will at once be called to matters of grave importance." The adjective "grave" marked a departure from the ordinary formula that could not fail to strike the country. It was felt to bear a special meaning, a meaning that was emphasized by the fact that, not Parliament as a whole, but the House of Commons alone, was designated as the body whom it most concerned. In the letter from the Government leader in the House of Lords advising Liberal Peers that Parliament was to meet on February 12th, a letter that was despatched simultaneously with the Premier's message to his supporters in the Commons, no mention was made of any "matters of grave importance." The inference was immediately drawn that the Prime Minister was revolving in his mind a policy that closely touched the prestige and utility of the House of Commons, and touched them primarily in their relation to the Upper Chamber. That this inference was correct I do not question; but the practical meaning to be read into it is more than, writing on the eve of the meeting of Parliament, I am able to forecast. This much, however, may safely be said—that the question of the House of Lords is now rapidly moving to the first place among English issues, and that the Government have definitely resolved to deal with it.

The subject is far too vast a one, and far too intricate, to be treated otherwise than scrappily in such a communication as this. Even to present its leading features would need more pages than

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

I have lines at my disposal. A hereditary Chamber embedded in an otherwise democratic Constitution is an obvious anachronism, but not on that account to be condemned except by those—their number, I fear, is increasing nowadays—who look upon politics as a branch of mathematics, and who set a greater store by the symmetry of political arrangements than by their practical convenience and adequacy. Englishmen, who are still inclined to pride themselves on their contempt for mere theories in the work of government, would not easily be wrought up into attacking an ancient institution merely because it failed to satisfy the fancied requirements of logic. Moreover, the House of Lords is not an unpopular assembly. There is not, I should judge, anything like as much feeling against it as obtains amongst Americans against the United States Senate. Individually, its members have an influence and a position that are accepted and approved by the people, and that draw their strength from the deep and rich soil of sanctified customs and traditions. Collectively, in their legislative capacity, they have opposed reforms but have rarely defeated them, and no charge of a tyrannous or unscrupulous use of their powers can be sustained against them.

The great political inconvenience of the Upper House in its present form is that it is overwhelmingly Tory. When a Tory Government is in power, the Lords, except as a mere ratifying Chamber, virtually cease to exist. They abandon their privilege of revision. Their "suspensory veto" is itself suspended. They will swallow any measure, however distasteful, so long as it bears the Tory label. But, directly a Liberal Government comes into office, the Lords awake from their stupor of inaction and assert themselves. No matter how strong the Government may be, they claim the right to reject or amend its proposals at will. A measure such as the Trades Disputes Bill they will pass, not because it has behind it a great popular backing, but because it is almost entirely a commercial question with which their own peculiar interests are not crucially concerned. Besides, to pass it may be a good move in the party game. But other Liberal measures that more intimately affect them as a privileged political class or as territorial magnates—measures, for instance, dealing with the land, the Church and education—they do not hesitate to throw out or to mutilate. It comes, therefore, to this—that, under a Liberal Government, the Lords only allow public

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

opinion to prevail when it favors measures that do not clash with their special interests. When measures are brought forward that antagonize those interests, the Lords disregard opinion and alter and reject them as they please. Thus in the last session they killed both the Plural Voting Bill and the Education Bill, though each was a measure approved of by the people at large. It is true that, by the practice of the Constitution, the Lords withdraw their opposition to any measure that is sent up to them again after a second General Election. But there are many measures—the Education Bill was one of them—which the people wish to see passed, which ought to be passed, and which yet do not warrant all the disturbance of a General Election in order to force them through the Upper House. And why, it may be asked, should a Liberal Government, just fresh from the polls, with a huge majority both in the Commons and in the country, be required to produce a certificate of two General Elections, when a Tory Government gets all it wishes with one? Is the majority only to rule effectively in Great Britain when it is a Tory majority?

Such are the questions that the Liberals are asking themselves; such is the dilemma in which they are placed. And it is a dilemma rendered all the more perplexing by the certainty that to "reform" the Lords, to make them more representative, to introduce the elective principle into their composition, to widen the area from which the Upper House is recruited, is simply to make it more powerful and at the same time to leave the balance of parties unredressed. The present Ministry has already seen the principal measure of its first session founder in the Lords. There is a prospect, there is more than a prospect, that the principal measure of its second session, the Irish Bill, will suffer similar shipwreck; and when it comes to tackle the land question there is no chance whatever that its views and those of the Lords can be harmonized. What under these circumstances is the course for it to pursue? To dissolve at once and appeal to the country on the general issue of the House of Lords is a policy more violent than bold. The Lords, so far, have only thrown out one of the Government's great measures; it is only thirteen months since we had a General Election; to have another one now is practically to admit the right of the Lords to force a dissolution whenever they choose; the experi-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ment of whether a Liberal Government can do its appointed work with the Lords in possession of their present powers has not yet been fully tried; above all, the country needs educating on the many and difficult issues which are involved. These arguments are decisive against an immediate dissolution. On the other hand, the Government cannot go on as though nothing had happened, nor can it submit to seeing legislative effect given only to such residuum among its projects of reform as the Lords may chance to approve. Said Mr. Winston Churchill a few days ago:

"The Peers had deliberately provoked a great constitutional struggle. Every effort at compromise and conciliation (in the matter of the Education Bill) had been insultingly rejected, and the Commons in the heyday of their strength and youth would take up the challenge without hesitation. . . . The Houses of Parliament would meet upon conditions of war; and it was their, the Commons', business to come to an understanding at once with those lordly persons and to show without delay that it was the House of Commons and not the House of Lords which would be master in the second Parliament of King Edward VII. No doubt, the end of such a conflict must be a general election. But there were many things to be done before they came to that. They had to pass a couple of good Radical Budgets; they had to formulate and develop their policy upon the land question; they had to educate the country upon the constitutional issues which were raised, and bring all progressive forces into the line of battle against a common enemy. The General Election would come soon enough for everybody. The battle of Lords and Commons had first to be fought out in Parliament."

The meaning of this, and of many other declarations by Ministers in a somewhat similar sense, I take to be that the Government intends to regulate its policy and strategy from now onwards by constant reference to the supreme issue of Lords *vs.* Commons. The negative side of its tactics will be to send up Bill after Bill, and to pile up a case against the Lords on the strength of each Bill the Lords reject or mutilate. But side by side with this manœuvre—which, though an easy one to prescribe, is a difficult one to carry out, for it asks a skilful and far-sighted selection of the measures that are to be placed in the front line of attack, and it asks also more sacrifice and restraint among the various sections of the Liberal party than they usually display—there is to be waged a direct and aggressive campaign in the House and in the country against the overriding of the popular Chamber. "A way will be found," said

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the Prime Minister at the end of last session, "whereby the wishes of the people may be made to prevail." It may be useful to compile a rough estimate of the resources of the Government and of the House of Commons in the emergency that confronts them. There is an immediate and an ulterior problem. The immediate one is to deal with the situation created by the rejection of the Education Bill. This may, perhaps, be effected by means of a simple Bill providing that no school shall be deemed to be a public elementary school which is not under full public control, absolving the teachers in such schools from all religious tests and vesting their appointment and dismissal in the local education authority. Again, the House of Commons has the undisputed and undivided control over the expenditure of all public money. If it were to refuse to pay Government grants to schools not under public control, it would seriously cripple the Church of England schools and might thus force the compromise it has failed to secure by negotiation.

So much for the specific and minor issue. It is, however, the larger, vaguer and infinitely more complex problem, of which the fate of the Education Bill is but a part, that most engages speculation. How can the present Government give effect to the wishes of its supporters against the will of the House of Lords? It possesses already the vast power of finance, a power which, if remorselessly used in a struggle between the two Houses, might of itself decide the conflict. A Ministry that exercises a sole jurisdiction over the kinds of taxes that are to be raised and over every detail of their allocution and expenditure, has a weapon to hand, if it cares or has the courage to use it, of incalculable potency. Then again, by a device which the House of Representatives has sometimes employed against the Senate, it is always possible to embody legislative provisions in the clauses of a money bill. The creation, or threatened creation—the threat in such cases is usually sufficient—of a number of new Peers to overcome the opposition of the Tory Lords is a third expedient that the Commons may, if they choose, adopt. But neither of these latter stratagems has the directness or the candor befitting the treatment of a great constitutional issue. Lord Crewe said a day or two ago, and with perfect truth, that the people of this country do not like to see one party in the political game playing with loaded dice. That is the position which the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Tories, through the use and abuse of their overwhelming numerical strength in the Upper House, at present occupy. But the people of this country have no wish to see the Liberals adopting the subterfuges and trickeries they denounce in their opponents; and a policy of legislating through money Bills and of creating Peers by the fifties, besides shelving instead of solving the essential question, would make a disagreeable impression of pettiness, if not of quackery. Heroic remedies are for heroic crises and at present there is no crisis, but only an emergency, or rather a condition of static inequality which circumstances have somewhat aggravated and which ought to be rectified. The best and most dignified way of facing it seems to be that of a series of resolutions which would precisely formulate the issues between the two Houses and provide, what is sadly needed, a basis for rational discussion. That was the course followed in 1860 when the Peers reimposed the paper duties which the Commons had remitted. Lord Palmerston brought forward three resolutions in the Lower House for the purpose of telling the Peers, as he put it, that the step they had taken in reenacting a tax which had been repealed by the Commons "was a very good joke for once, but they must not give it to us again." The Peers took the hint then; they might conceivably see fit to take it again. If Sir Henry Campbell-Bannerman were to introduce resolutions stigmatizing the partisan character of the Upper House, reaffirming the supremacy of the House of Commons as the organ of the nation's will, and limiting the veto of the Peers to the duration of a single session, their effect, while devoid of the force of law—for the Peers, naturally enough, would decline to accept them—would at least have the virtue of a serious and impressive warning. If the warning were disregarded the next step would probably be the incorporation of the resolutions in a Bill. If the Bill in its turn were rejected, there would then be nothing for it but a General Election, fought out on the specific issue of curtailing the prerogatives of the House of Lords. I do not say that such is, indeed, the double-barrelled programme which official Liberalism contemplates; but among unofficial Liberals there is a very strong sentiment in its favor, nor would it lack support from the people. What, at any rate, may be safely assumed is that the question, once definitely raised, cannot and will not be dropped until it has been carried to a clear and comprehensive issue.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ST. PETERSBURG, *February, 1907.*

AT last the elections have begun, and the most sceptical subjects of the Tsar are now convinced that the Government is endeavoring in earnest to introduce representative institutions into the country. Excitement, therefore, is intense at meetings and in public places, for this time all political parties and factions are taking an active part in the struggle. Even the revolutionists have decided, without abandoning their deeds of blood, to record their votes for the enemies of the Government. But the enthusiasm which is noticeable in various parts of the Empire is fitful. Thus many hate to put themselves out and go to the voting-booth on a frosty day; but there are exceptions, and the exceptions are generally the adversaries of the Government and of the *régime*.

The first elections that took place in the towns were primary; that is to say, they were not for members of the Duma, but for delegates who will contribute later on to return Deputies to the Duma. On the first day, the frost, which was intense, kept many voters away; but, of those who braved the cold, the most part were staunch supporters of the Socialist, the Revolutionary or the Democratic party. From the villages where the peasants have since chosen their men of confidence, a different story has come. The semiofficial telegraphic agency describes the selected delegates as Moderates or Conservatives. But only those believe this who hope the tale is true. My own forefeeling—it is hardly more than that—is that the country has sent, and will send, representatives of the extreme Monarchist and the Revolutionary parties, and also a mass of peasants who may be swayed by either.

If the Duma wisely narrows down its aggressive action to constitutional attacks on the Stolypin Cabinet, it will have the Government at a serious disadvantage. For, however warmly one may defend the monarchical system as the most suited for the Russian people until they are better fitted for self-government, one cannot but admit that the present Cabinet is no longer much of a help to the monarchy. Most people regard it as a hindrance. Certain of its members have deliberately exceeded their powers, some have utilized their position for their own private benefit, while others are simply incapable of transacting the business of the nation during a revolutionary crisis. Nothing, therefore, would be easier than to upset the present Cabinet,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

so long as the lever pressed is constitutional. If the Duma, instead of asking that the Tsar shall choose his advisers from the parliamentary majority, analyzes the important acts of certain of his Ministers in the broad light of day, it is virtually certain that the Crown will soon disavow the measures and dismiss the men.

One of the principal misdemeanors complained of was committed by the Ministry of the Interior, for which the Premier himself is responsible. Corn was needed by the hunger-stricken peasants of twenty-seven provinces, and the Government resolved to purchase and distribute it. This transaction, owing to its magnitude, required delicate handling; for, if it became known that the Treasury was buying a vast amount of corn to be delivered by a certain date, prices would rise proportionately or even disproportionately. To obviate this, a competent person or committee ought to have been charged with the execution of the order. Formerly, the business was confided to a competent board. But M. Stolypin, say his adversaries, needlessly altered this arrangement and handed the matter over to his own adjoint, Gurko, a man who is uncommonly able, resourceful, pushing, self-centred and haughty. Gurko, meeting a contractor whose ways reminded him of enterprising Americans, asked him whether he would buy the corn; and then, having bargained for very acceptable terms, gave him the contract and four hundred thousand dollars in advance. If this man had indeed been an enterprising American, the peasantry and the Government would have both had reason to rejoice. For it was perhaps an excellent way to get the corn cheaply and speedily. But whether the agent was also the right sort of person may be doubted. In any case the subordinate Minister had exceeded his powers and technically committed an offence, and, as the arrangement has since proved abortive, he lacks defenders. The contractor had no money of his own, no property, no commercial past, no guarantees for the future. Very soon the matter was bruited abroad by an enemy of the Government, and, as secrecy is indispensable to success in dealings of this kind, premature publicity ruined the arrangement. Doubtless it might have failed in any case. But, as a matter of fact, prices rose rapidly, the contractor could no longer purchase rye at rates which would have given him a profit, the contract could not be fulfilled and the hungry peasants suffered

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

as well as everybody else concerned. For a time, M. Stolypin hesitated what course to take, then he had a Commission appointed to inquire into the transaction; but, although the Committee found that M. Gurko had gone beyond his powers and must be sent for trial on this charge, the Premier has allowed him to remain in office down to this moment. Consequently, from first to last, the Premier has technically covered with his own person the policy of his subordinate and shares with him the blame for breaking the law.

Then comes another and a more serious matter. The Premier is accused of having violated the fundamental laws by restricting the franchise and depriving tens of thousands of electors of their votes. He answers that he did restrict the franchise, but without breaking the law. He conscientiously refused to alter the electoral law as it now stands, because that would, he held, be tantamount to a *coup d'état*. But immediately afterwards he caused a Department of the Senate to interpret the electoral law in a most restrictive sense, so that what he feared to take by hook, he got by crook. Whether technically he committed a misdemeanor depends upon the construction put upon the clauses of the law, but it is only fair to say that some of the Senators themselves are of opinion that the statute was violated in this case. Whether it would follow that the present elections are null and void and the Premier guilty of a punishable offence is open to discussion.

A third count against the Cabinet raises one of the most important problems of all, the finances of the Empire. The Opposition maintains that the financial policy struck out by the present Minister, M. Kokovtseff, is baleful to the country, and that the Minister himself is professionally incompetent and ethically unfit to remain at the head of his department. If this accusation were proferred by Radicals alone, one would be warranted in receiving it with mistrust; for the Opposition itself left nothing undone to ruin the finances of the Empire deliberately, perseveringly and for the sole purpose of triumphing over the partisans of the monarchy. Patriotism, therefore, which is usually presupposed as the motive of the accusers in this category of offences, cannot be assumed in the present case. But it is not only the Opposition that is dissatisfied with M. Kokovtseff. Some of the most zealous of the partisans of the Government are equally discontented with

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

him, on grounds which to most people will appear cogent or at least reasonable.

M. Kokovtseff's financial policy is now complained of by every one in Russia who understands the subject. The superabundance of paper currency is one of its drawbacks. There are now six hundred million dollars circulating in the form of banknotes, besides three hundred and twenty-five millions in gold and one hundred and twenty-five millions in treasury bonds which are employed as banknotes. Three years and four months ago, when Witté quitted the Finance Ministry, there were in circulation only two hundred and seventy-seven million dollars' worth of banknotes, three hundred and eighty millions in gold and fifty millions in treasury bonds. M. Kokovtseff's policy, therefore, involved the increase of money in circulation by forty-eight per cent., whereas the increase in trade has been either insignificant or *nil*. His shortsightedness necessitated a high rate of interest for the recent loans, because the time chosen for borrowing was inauspicious. And M. Kokovtseff has done nothing to better all this. He has been reposing on the laurels gained by Witté. His budget has been balanced by Witté's foreign loan; the paper notes are covered by Witté's gold; the revenue is formed of taxes levied by Witté's system. M. Kokovtseff can point to nothing of his own. Yet he could and should have adopted a series of effectual measures. The present Cabinet has evinced a marvellous degree of ingenuity in enacting laws, despite the Tsar's promise to issue no law in future without the consent of the Duma. *Honi soit qui mal y pense.* It has given the peasantry considerable relief in a circuitous way, striking off their fetters and enabling them to purchase land; it has accorded liberty of conscience to millions, and in many other departments of life it has done excellent work. But in the financial domain neither the Cabinet nor the Minister has accomplished or even attempted anything. Yet nothing would have been easier than to issue a law cutting down wasteful expenditure. The amount, for instance, annually squandered on yearly or life annuities for able-bodied officials who are in receipt of fat salaries is very considerable. And it has not been lessened. Yet the main source of relief is precisely that careful economy of which the Minister seems afraid.

M. Kokovtseff has, however, abolished the annuities called "rents." In bygone times the monarch was wont to show his

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

recognition for services rendered by presenting the object of his favor with lands. To-day, instead of an estate, a fixed sum of money is bestowed annually for a certain time or during life. Many widows and orphans whose pensions are slender—$500 to $1,500 a year—receive a "rent" of as much again. Now, to these ill-starred people the loss of one-half or one-third of their slender income will be very painful indeed; and there have been bitter complaints on the subject. The gain to the country, too, is a mere trifle, from $500,000 dollars to $1,000,000. But the Minister is austerely inexorable—a sort of Lucius Brutus condemning his own sons to death and witnessing their execution.

At the same time, however, M. Kokovtseff has been, it is said, prolonging the annuities of certain of his friends who are in receipt of large salaries. If true, that accusation will prove damaging. And, unhappily, it is not all. M. Kokovtseff, it is further alleged—and this time the facts are apparently firmly established—has obtained for his own self an annuity of four thousand rubles, although he is receiving eighteen thousand as Finance Minister. It seems very cruel thus to enrich himself at the moment that he is heroically depriving shabby-genteel widows and pale-faced orphans of one-half or one-third of their yearly incomes. Ought the man who can do this trick to remain at the head of the finances of the Empire in a period of revolution? Is he a help to his sovereign? He has, it is further alleged, got this annuity for himself in an underhand way, through the medium of two friends, and having obtained it, he innocently said to the Premier: "Could I have refused the offer coming from his Majesty, unsolicited by me?"

There are many other counts in the indictment against M. Kokovtseff. But those which I have enumerated may stand as types. Unhappily, M. Stolypin, who is himself the soul of honor, has publicly sung the praises of his Finance Minister, and will therefore technically have to bear his share of the blame attaching to that Minister's acts. In a word, the Opposition will have ammunition enough to batter breaches in the Cabinet and even to annihilate it, if that be the object of its attack.

One of its trump cards will be the alleged fact that the official advisers of the Crown are not the real advisers. And among the evidence is the action taken in the matter of reorganizing the fleet. An elaborate scheme was recently drafted dividing

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the administration of the navy into several departments, making the chief of each one answerable for his service to the Crown only, and abolishing the post of Marine Minister. When the Marine Minister, Birileff, was summoned to a council in Tsarskoye Selo, under the chairmanship of the Emperor, to discuss the condition of the navy, he learned for the first time that such a project existed. That scheme would have abolished his office. Yet he had been, until a few weeks before, one of the court favorites, a *persona gratissima* despite grave disqualifications. "They evidently don't want me here," he murmured; and, drawing one of the consequences, he tendered his resignation. There was nothing else to do. Birileff's disgrace is a matter of indifference. What is really important is the conditions that led to it, because they still continue to prevail.

The navy reorganization scheme will go on, must go on, if Russia is ever to regain her lost position; but whether it will be tackled skilfully and carried out successfully is open to question. The new Minister is a respectable, elderly gentleman, but he is only an average naval officer and a poor administrator. The Tsar has, it is true, given him a number of relatively young admirals as assistants, but their worth is varied, some of them owing their promotion wholly to favor. Admiral Bostrem is an instance. He distinguished himself negatively during the war; and, curiously enough, he ruined the career of his chief without impairing his own. It happened in this way. Admiral Jessen, the only man who achieved any success on sea against the Japanese, came home in charge of three vessels. One of these, the "Bogatyr," was commanded by Captain Bostrem, who brought it into port in such a deplorable state that Admiral Skrydloff, whose duty it was to inspect the ships, sharply reprimanded Admiral Jessen, who immediately resigned. But Captain Bostrem had friends at court who have been active ever since, and he has just now been made Subordinate Minister with the powers of a Minister.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE EDITOR'S DIARY.

WEDNESDAY, *March 6.* Existence in a Great City.

WE wonder if the people throughout the country are as glum as those who have their being in the great city where it is our misfortune to live. Here everybody—rich man, poor man, beggar-man—appears depressed. The thief alone, according to the newspapers, is blithe and gay; all others abide in an atmosphere, if not of gloom, at least of meditation, tinctured with discontent.

Everybody is cross—the merchant, because he is obliged to transact more business upon a closer margin of profit; the banker, because high rates for money do not counterbalance a sense of instability; the broker, because only the elect make gains in a declining market; the manufacturer, because the greater cost of materials and higher wages exceed the enhanced value of his finished product; the minister, because his flock is sinful and indifferent to the needs of his family; the directors of great industries, because further expansion is estopped by capital's fright at official activities; women, because landlord, grocer and butcher absorb the increase in income and more, leaving less than ever for plumage and fine raiment, and so it goes throughout the list.

Statistics seem to demonstrate that we are prosperous, but personal observation contradicts the conclusion. Worthy charities never required so much; yesterday we were accosted by three beggars on a single block; this morning come urgent appeals to save two families from being turned into the street; willingness to work apparently exceeds the opportunity.

Everybody is ill in body or mind, but chiefly in the throat; the streets are filthy; the air laden with germs of disease; none speaks but to cough or sneeze or utter profane language; the hand of the dentist trembles and lacerates the nerves; the physician cannot heal himself; there is no health in us.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The newspapers scold and scold and scold. There is no fun any more—no ray of relief from the incessant clamor of real or fancied wrongs, no sign of joyousness, not even a joke or quip or pun outside of "Life" and the back part of "Harper's Weekly."

We wish the snow and slush would go away, and the robins would hasten their coming; we want to hear somebody laugh.

THURSDAY, *March 7.* Some More Letters.

To-day's post brings:

"SIR,—My Quaker ancestry moves me to speak, but not possessing a megaphonic voice, there seems nothing left for me to do but write.

"That which endears the REVIEW to my unregenerate soul is your Editor's Diary. I am supposing you to be the author of those delightful and sometimes whimsical screeds—though it really does not matter whether it's you or another—to me they are 'as good news from a far country,' or 'cold water to a thirsty soul.' Hitherto I have sternly repressed my longing to cast one flower before the editorial shrine, but I realize that repression, carried to excess, may easily become a nuisance to its possessor.

"The question of taxation for spinsters and bachelors is a matter to be approached with some caution. Are you in a position to judge as to the justice of such a tax? What do you know about it, anyway? *You* cannot put yourself in *her* place (for obvious reasons), and neither can you put yourself in *his* place, for other reasons which will readily occur to you; while I—well, from observation and experience, I *know* that 'a bachelor is a wretch, sir, a miserable wretch,' and I would not burden their already 'miserable' existence by so much as a groat.

"But, then, there is the spinster's side to be thought of, too. I am sure they are not all spinsters from choice. Necessity has much to do in this matter, and if they are taxed for a condition they are in through no fault of their own, that would merely be adding to the 'sorrows of Satan,' without correcting the evil. Here is a solution which you might find it expedient to exploit: Induce the Government to place a good premium upon every spinster over thirty years of age, and in less than six weeks there would be no spinsters left to tell the tale, and you might search the land from sea to sea and not find a bachelor.

"And there is that screed 'On Being Younger or Older.' You say, 'Who cares?' Well, *you* 'care,' for one, and *I* 'care,' for another. *Every* one cares. No one likes to be laid neatly, or carelessly, away on a shelf, even if the shelf *is* padded. Antiques are all very well when confined to inanimate objects, but who wants a crabbed human antique about the house? It is not so much that they are non-decorative; we do not insist upon their æsthetically harmonizing with their surroundings; but they decline to admit that they were ever guilty of youthful

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

follies, their stereotyped phrase being (surely you recognize it?): 'Well, they never did this or that when *I* was young.'

"History repeats itself. You admit that 'Woman's Right to Enhance Nature's Charms' is both expedient and wise. Turn to the oldest 'woman's rights' document—presented to King Ladislaus IV, of Poland, in 1635—and the thirteenth paragraph says: 'Inasmuch as not all women are favored with good looks, we earnestly recommend the Diet not to place duty on cosmetics or other stuffs for beautifying the human face or form, for every woman should be allowed to make herself as pretty as possible, so she may secure a husband for herself.'

"You say you 'make it a point seldom to criticise publicly the methods of the Creator.' Now, I like that remark; it shows a reticence as touching as it is beautiful. And you add: 'God knows, as well as we, that there is nothing more hideous than a plashy feminine appearance.' Ah, my brother, there is, there is. What about a bleary, a wheezy, flabby old bald-headed man with three feet in the grave, trying to pose as a gallant of twenty-five? Ah, the injustice of Providence!

"But the real object of this impeachment is not to impeach—as you might suppose, but to thank you for what you say regarding 'God's Omnipotence.' You explain what I have always dimly felt, but have never ventured to question. The last paragraph in your article gives me renewed faith in the real goodness of God. I never before have been able to reconcile God's mercy and goodness with the suffering, the sorrow and the sin of this world. Your editorial upon the subject clears my vision, as no sermon has ever been able to do—and again I thank you.

"I am, sir, etc., B. FAWCETT.

"ALBION, NEW YORK."

"SIR,—With the greatest pain, surprise and disappointment, I read the blasphemous article, 'Is God Omnipotent?' in your last issue. As the article was purely a (un) doctrinal statement of the writer, and should find no place in the magazine that has such a standing with our American readers, I am still so confident in you that I dare venture to state such faults will be few, if any, in the future. Had it been treating of a religio-political or religio-social subject on the part of one of your writers, it would not seem so shocking as it does, coming *ex cathedra* from the editor.

"Your magazine, if such should be continued despite the protests of your readers, will not be any better than the theological knowledge of your 'theologian' who forgets or ignores reason in his teachings of error.

"I am, sir, etc.,

"MICHAEL D. COLLINS.

"SAINT MARY'S, MISSOURI, IMMACULATE CONCEPTION RECTORY."

"SIR,—I am always much interested in your 'preachments' in the Editor's Diary, and highly appreciate them. But what you say in regard to Unitarian belief in the last issue of your REVIEW, under the heading,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

'Is God Omnipotent?' I cannot let pass without a word of protest, and I think that mine will not be the only one. For what you proclaim and praise as the distinctive feature of the so-called 'New Theology' in England has been preached in our Unitarian churches for the last fifty years or longer; if Unitarianism tried to do anything, it was to do away with this gulf between man and God, by showing that human nature is divine, and that the sonship of God is a real thing. I think that you would be interested to look into Unitarian literature, which broadly treats on the beliefs commonly held by Unitarians, for there is no uniform fixed creed excepting that of perfect individual liberty, and I shall send you under separate cover a few mission tracts as well as a clipping from recent newspapers which will enlighten you as to our theological position. Hoping that you will set aright in your REVIEW the wrong impression your article must have made upon those not acquainted with Unitarian teaching,

"I am, sir, etc., GEORGE R. GIBAULT.

"ALTON, ILLINOIS."

"SIR,—Notes from the Editor's Diary move me to say that to me God is omnipotent in the sense that He has all the power there is. There *is* no power to 'make a two-year-old calf in a minute,' or to create a race of beings who are free and responsible in will, and yet have no results follow from their free choice. That the determination of events can thus be committed to those whose choice is always imperfect, and sometimes malign, by a Supreme Being who seeks the best, is because any number, however small, of beings choosing righteousness, and attaining some degree of it through struggle and suffering, is of higher moral value than that the whole race should be correct puppets. If this free action is not in the end overruled, bringing the best finally to each, then is the time to arraign power and goodness; but this requires a wider space in which to turn than this small earth affords.

"Again, power and goodness should not be arraigned for the existence of suffering until we know that temporary suffering is an evil, any more than occasional discords in music.

"As to the 'futile' explanation of the ways of Providence being inscrutable, how could one mind be superior to another and not have its plans at times inscrutable to the lesser mind? The child called from the making of mud pies, which seems to him at the time the only good, to crawl with shining morning face unwillingly to school, is submitting to the inscrutable ways of parental providence, which desires him to rise in time above the making of mud pies!

"I am, sir, etc., MARY B. DIMOND.

"WICHITA, KANSAS."

"SIR,—When an educated and influential editor can, in these days, robustly publish that he 'does not believe that God is omnipotent,' he introduces a momentous question into the arena of modern discussion.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

"I am one of those who believe that any man's honest belief is worthy of attention, and that we learn more from those who differ from us than from those who agree with us. There is no crime in any belief which is true to the man. The expression of it is free from blame, but it is not exempt from reasonable criticism.

"When I had read the editor's confession of faith, it reminded me of my early years when I read Baron d'Holbach's 'System of Nature,' from which our friend Colonel Ingersoll imbibed so freely; also Laplace's reply to Napoleon, when asked why he did not mention the name of God in his 'Celestial Mechanics,' that in explaining the mysteries of the universe he had no occasion to think of such a Being. Herbert Spencer considered the idea of God as unthinkable.

"To these men no God was necessary; only matter and energy.

"To Voltaire, Franklin, Thomas Paine and Napoleon, a God was necessary, but they did not think it imperative that He should employ Himself with human affairs. At seventy years of age, Franklin changed his mind, and confessed to a belief in an overruling Providence. He died with his eyes fixed upon a picture of the Crucifixion.

"But most of those who believe in the existence of a God consider Him infinite in life, power and virtues.

"Our editor and a few others can only accept a God partly divine and partly human, who does the best He can for us, but is not competent to supply all our needs. This naturally reminds one of Voltaire's witty remark that 'God made Man in His own image, and now Man returns the compliment.'

"These judges do not invent a Devil, as the barbaric nations do, to take all the blame of what they conceive to be defects in the universe while giving to God all the glory of what they deem to be good; but they excuse God by denying His omnipotence and by declaring that He cannot do any better.

"As no human being lives long enough, sees far enough, or has sufficient expansion of reason, to include all sides of this question, the most that mortals can do is to decide which of all of these doubts or beliefs is most likely to be true. The greatest obstacle to an emphatic and final decision to the question of God's omnipotence lies in the fact that the God of the Universe cannot be judged by His peers. He must be judged only by His own creatures, limited, undeveloped and unable fully to comprehend what a God is and what omnipotence implies.

"Those who believe God to be partly divine and partly human, seem to base their belief upon the following data:

"1. That God is the Prime Potential of the Universe.

"2. That He created all matter and charged it, for eternity, with His will, which is called the law of nature.

"3. That a Supreme Power is a Supreme responsibility.

"4. That if God is good, merciful and omnipotent, He would protect us from pain, sorrow or misfortune.

"In spite of these presumptions, we suffer from pain, calamity, death, destruction, insanity and wars.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

"From these facts it is argued that God either cannot help us or that He inflicts them upon us as punishments.

"I deny that they are punishments, and also that God is impotent to protect us.

"Instead of being impotent to protect us, these very crosses are ordained by Himself to develop our race in manhood, character and loftier lives. They are not punishments, but discipline. In the wide range of creation, I deny that there is any divine punishment.

"God has created Man, but not yet the perfect Man. He is yet in the process of creation. After a hundred thousand years of discipline, varying with the age and clime, the Man of the present period may have been disciplined into the perfect Man.

"God has plenty of time, and He will take it.

"In a poem called 'The Logos of Theism,' written many years ago by myself, the same idea is expressed, as follows:

"'Of all, of saint or sinner, I am God;
God of your Good, your Evil, joys and tears.
Judge not My Mercy by Time's thorny rod,
Judge not My ways through mortal atmospheres.
Judge not eternity by finite years.
Judge not My meal by your few dismal crumbs;
Your world will wither ere the Truth appears;
At some far time, the fitting answer comes.
I have the time to spare, and wait millenniums.'

"Pain locates power and material for cure. Disease impels us to study the human body, one of the greatest works of our Creator. It also prompts us to ransack the universe for help. Poverty and calamity are necessary to develop charity, and they contribute to our recognition of the brotherhood of man. Death is promotion. Destruction leads to reconstruction on improved models. The poets teach us these truths, that 'Matter up to Spirit works,' and that Spirits up 'to higher levels rise.' Nothing is at rest, and the motion is forward and upward. The universe is charged with God's infinite intention to advance. Every day increases the sum of things in Matter and in Mind, in quantity and quality.

"Man is endowed with forty different faculties. As this world is organized, the normal brain is not supplied with magnetism sufficient to live in more than three or four faculties simultaneously. No man ever goes to the grave believing that he has accomplished all he might have done, if the power had been supplied according to his desires. The normal man can only live in one-tenth of his faculties at the same time. He was made for a world which will supply him with ten times as much magnetism as this world supplies. When projected into that magnetic world, he will be almost like a god in comparison to his limited being on this earth.

"It is true that there are brain diseases which in this life unite more than three or four human faculties. Cambyses, Cæsar, Mahomet and

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Napoleon were all epileptics. Socrates, Joan of Arc, Thomas à Kempis and many others had hyperesthetic brains. But what normal man could live such lives or even desire to live them?

"In the future world these great beings will infinitely surpass themselves by having in the atmosphere around them a sufficient supply of magnetism to animate all their faculties without sickness and the distortions of sickness. This will be supplied without sleep and without nourishment. There will be a consciousness of perpetual life such as cannot be approached while in the flesh. After they have penetrated and studied the universe for ten thousand years and have found, in a million worlds, countless millions of different sets of laws, animals and souls, all produced and sustained by the same Creator, they will begin to have a dim idea of His omnipotence and perfection.

"I am, sir, etc., ALEXANDER HAMILTON LAIDLAW, A.M.

"NEW YORK CITY."

"SIR,—I wish to express my appreciation of your article in the February issue, entitled 'Is God Omnipotent?'

"My wife and myself have been trying to reconcile religion with the loss of a dear little boy, who passed away a few months ago, and your few words are the most consoling ones from a religious view-point we have found.

"Can you refer me to other writings along the line that 'God stands for the infinite reality—which is the source of all things, but is itself still in process of fulfilment in a manner which is suggestively adumbrated in the evolution of humanity'?

"Your kindness will be appreciated.

"I am, sir, etc., LOUIS C. ROWE.

"OSWEGO, NEW YORK."

"SIR,—In your Editor's Diary of February 1st, you say: 'If your God be all-powerful and true and kind, why does He permit sin and suffering to sadden countless generations of His children who wish to revere and love Him?' I do not pretend to be able to answer that question, although I confess that I believe that God is Almighty, and that He does permit sin and suffering. I may be presuming too much in taking up your question as if it were a personal one addressed to every Christian who might happen to read it; and yet I have enough confidence in your open-mindedness and courtesy to ask you one or two questions in reply. Not that I mean you to answer them, but simply in the hope of getting them before your mind.

"May not God permit sin and suffering for reasons like those which at times influence us, if we are wise, when we too permit sin and suffering

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

which we could prevent, and would, did we not clearly see that some lessons are not learned except in the school of bitter experience?

"Does the fact that God has permitted sin and suffering, or the fact that He does not at once end them, necessarily imply a limitation of His power? Is not the question really one concerning His wisdom? Was it wise for Him to permit them? Is His way of overcoming them the best way?

"Does not your question really mean that it is suffering which saddens men? Is not the real cause sin? How else will you explain the peace and cheerfulness of the sufferer who believes that his sins are forgiven?

"Would a world in which men were automatons be a higher manifestation of divine power and wisdom than the world as it is, taking it for granted, of course, that God is the Redeemer as well as the Creator of the world?

"Would the character of Christ have had the same perfection and beauty had the element of suffering been wanting?

"I have often wondered why it has never entered the mind of a scientist like John Burroughs, for instance, that there might be other systems of theology than the one under which he was raised and against which he reacted. The same thought comes to my mind as I read what you have to say about 'a God whom we have been taught, not to love but to fear —lest we perish'! I am trying to serve a God whom I believe to be all-powerful and true and kind, and by Whose permission I believe sin and suffering to be here; but I am not at all conscious of doing it from any motive of cowardice and fear, but because I have learned that out of His great love He 'has redeemed me, a lost and condemned creature, purchased and won me from all sin, from death and the power of the devil, not with silver and gold, but with His holy and precious blood, and His innocent sufferings and death, in order that I might be His, live under Him in His kingdom, and serve Him in everlasting righteousness, innocence and blessedness, even as He is risen from the dead, and lives and reigns to all eternity.'

"You will agree that the Bible professes to be a revelation from God, and that there is wide-spread belief that it is such. Perhaps you will agree, too, that the best thoughts men have had about God, whether true or not, have been derived from the Bible. Even though many questions can be asked that I cannot answer, am I foolish to believe the Bible when it teaches that 'Where sin abounded grace did abound more exceedingly'; that 'whom the Lord loveth He reproveth, even as a father the son in whom he delighteth'; that 'our light affliction, which is for the moment, worketh for us more and more exceedingly an eternal weight of glory'? Why should we not believe, in spite of all perplexities, when experience still verifies the assertion that 'all chastening seemeth for the present to be not joyous, but grievous; yet afterward it yieldeth peaceable fruit unto them that have been exercised thereby, even the fruit of righteousness.'

"With Bishop Thorold, 'I can just barely conceive of a God who is Almighty, but I cannot at all conceive of a God who is not Almighty.'

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

"Is it not true that the doctrine of evolution is but a theory, and one which in its present form has little resemblance to the Darwinian? And yet it is on the Darwinian theory that most of the negative criticism of the Bible rests. Moreover, the Wellhausen school of Old Testament criticism is disintegrating, and the indications are that it will follow after Tübingen, and every other effort men ever organized to shake men's faith in the Bible as the Word of God. For the layman in science, is not Romanes's witness for Christianity worth more than Huxley's or Spencer's against it? "I am, sir, etc., FREDERICK E. COOPER.

"SOUTH BETHLEHEM, PENNSYLVANIA."

FRIDAY, *March 8.* Singularity of the Jamestown Exposition.

THE Jamestown Exposition offers an opportunity for a historical, educational and uplifting exhibit such as no other has ever presented. Social economy is the science which has been born and has grown to maturity in the last three hundred years. Never before has the bond between class and class, between man and man, been so closely knit and so significant. The phrase, "the solidarity of the race," is heard on all sides. Never before have there been so many societies for binding men together, for organizing labor, for civic education and enlightenment, for ameliorating the conditions of the poor and enlightening the criminal classes. These are the phases of life which, it is hoped, the new Exposition will emphasize. A mere commercial exhibit will be but a repetition of what has been done, and done *ad nauseam,* over and over again in the last thirty years. Commerce is but a small detail in the growth of this nation. The nation's growth as a moral force, as a leader in the new sense of the unity of mankind, as a higher development in the racial history of the sense of brotherly responsibility, of justice and education and enlightenment, and equal opportunities for all men, these are the points to be emphasized by the Jamestown Exposition.

SATURDAY, *March 9.* Of the Life Romantic.

WHY is it that in middle age the novel so palls upon us, while we turn instinctively to biography and letters, or to poetry and history, for our lighter reading? It seems a fact too readily overlooked that the very form of life's romance changes with the years. It is undoubtedly a provision of nature that the emotional life should be paramount from eighteen to thirty; but surely the glamour shed about the amative relations begins to wane with

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

middle age, and we find either new food for the life romantic or we settle into a dull routine of recurrent occupations. It is then that personal optimism and pessimism are put to the test. To let the sweeping pageant of life become all drab and dreary is to admit failure in life, and to live with ever-increasing zest and interest is to have captured success.

The greatest free gift of the years is impersonality. That voracious interest in ourselves which is so natural a limitation of youth fades of its own accord as we grow to fuller knowledge of our slight endowment, the paucity of our spoken lines and the fragmentary and insignificant part of our rôle in life. And then what is to fill up the void? We are, after all, not cast for the hero's part; but are we to sink into mere hardened machines? The gift of entirely impersonal enjoyment is one of the greatest of life's events. When it falls upon us we can adorn our secret corners of delight and learn to live in them. We begin to listen to music with no disquieting desire to have it interpret our personal emotions or feed our ambitions. We can look at pictures and nature with a new and a more liberal interest.

There is a shifting of basis, by which, if we will, we may gain complete advantage. As in youth we cling to some glorified fragment of the past or hold out our hands to some warm hope of an unearned but magnificent future, so in middle age we come, if we will, to a moment richer and nobler in itself. If in youth we use the senses for personal aggrandizement, in maturity we learn to enjoy them for themselves. It is a shifting of basis from emotion to perception, and the perceptions can give as keen a pleasure, every whit, as the emotions.

To keep the sight and the hearing ever alert, attuned to wider visions and fuller harmonies, is to be on the winning side in the game of life. To observe the world in the gross, as it subserves a personal interest, is not particularly vivifying, but continually to see and to hear more delicately, more exactly, is to intensify life and life's interest. As the demand of the intellect is to feel itself ever increasing in power and scope, so the demand of the senses is for continuous refinement and delicacy of resource, and this is to become, as we age, not less but more alive till, at the instant of Death, Destiny shall overtake us at the very flood-tide of our abilities and our zest.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

MONDAY, *March 11.* The Ancient Doctrine of True Love.

BOOKS very often give us the feeling that everything in the world has been thought and that all the tumult and din of speech and print are but a recasting of what has been thought and said since ever words were committed to parchment. The only change one can find is in the audience addressed. The doctrine which was offered in secret in 1575 to the elected disciple is sung abroad in 1905 for him who will, to hear. The manner of the modern doctrine, too, if somewhat less exalted, is still sincere and convincing.

Jacob Boehme in his "Dialogue of the Supersensual Life," says to his disciple:

"As Heaven rules the World, and as eternity rules time, even so must love rule the natural, temporal Life; for no other method is there, neither can there be, of attaining to that Life which is supernatural and eternal. . . . The virtue of Love is through all things; its height is as high as God; its greatness as great as God; its virtue is the principle of all principles; its power supports the Heavens and upholds the earth; . . . Love is higher than the Highest; Love is greater than the greatest . . . it is the virtue of all virtues . . . the power of all powers. . . . When thou art gone forth wholly from the creature and from that which is visible, and art become nothing to all that is nature and creature, then thou art in that Eternal One, which is God; and then thou shalt perceive and feel within thee the highest virtue of Love, whose power is through all things. . . . Thou shalt then see also in all the works of God how Love hath poured forth itself into all things, and is the most inward and most outward ground of all things; inwardly in the virtue and power of everything, and outwardly in the figure and form. . . . Love hates all egoism, hates all that which we call I, or I-hood; hates all restrictions and confinements; hates all that springs from a contracted Spirit or from this Selfhood, which is so hateful and deadly a thing. . . . But in Love there is such infinity as comprehends and surpasses all the divine attributes."

Thus was the solidarity of all creation taught in the sixteenth century by the illuminated cobbler. To-day we find the message uttered to the masses in less intellectual and more colloquial form thus:

"Justice is in bond. What will deliver justice? Hate? Love? I say, Love's hand will deliver. . . . Because we love . . . not love a few. Not love a class, or some church, or some petty social or national interest. Because we love all. For no solution that would not be a solution for all would be a solution for one. As long as we do not solve the trouble

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

for all we do not solve it for one. It will forever recur until the last unit is enclosed. The law of love is not the law for a parish—a law for one day. It is a law for the whole world. For forever. The law of love could not put one item of social evil under ban or under approval. . . . Can you isolate a structure from its detail? Can you separate the body from its flesh? So many things need to be done in order that one thing may be done. But they must all be done for the one result."

There is a gap of three hundred years between the two utterances; there is the difference of the mediæval and the modern form of thought, but the underlying doctrine is identical, like Shelley, who declared that perfect man must be "free, unclassed, tribeless and nationless"; like Kant, who gave as the one secure rule of right that "we act according to a maxim which might become a universal law"; like all the deep-seeing prophets, these two men are assuring that a personal interest is a contradiction in terms and that there is no possibility of gaining by another's loss or separating the interests of that indissoluble whole, humanity.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED